

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.

SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3209

(202) 326-7900

FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

August 19, 2003

Ex Parte Presentation

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Application by SBC Communications Inc., et al. for Provision of In-Region,
InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin, WC Docket
No. 03-167*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On behalf of SBC Communications Inc. ("SBC"), and at the request of Commission staff, I am attaching an updated analysis of BearingPoint's performance metrics review, incorporating data contained in BearingPoint's August 1, 2003, Draft Report. In accordance with this Commission's Public Notice, DA 03-2344 (July 17, 2003), SBC is filing this letter and its attachment electronically through the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System.

Yours truly,


Colin S. Stretch

Attachment

cc:	Pam Arluk	Hisham Choueiki
	Ben Childers	Nicholas Linden
	Janice Myles	Layla Seirafi-Najar
	Jon Feipel	Qualex International
	Karl Henry	

ATTACHMENT

BEARINGPOINT PERFORMANCE METRICS REVIEW -- UPDATE

In its July 17, 2003 Joint Application, Illinois Bell, Indiana Bell, Ohio Bell, and Wisconsin Bell (the “BOC Applicants”) provided a series of charts that focus on the then-current status of certain Performance Metrics Review (PMR) testing based upon BearingPoint’s then most recent Draft Reports for each state. BOC Applicants demonstrated in their joint filing that the issues BearingPoint has identified do not undermine Ernest & Young’s performance audit conclusions, which BOC Applicants rely upon, in part, to demonstrate the reliability of their reported performance results.¹

On August 1, 2003, as directed by the Illinois Commerce Commission Staff, BearingPoint issued a new bi-monthly report of the progress of its PMR testing in Illinois.² This August 1, 2003 Draft Report updates the previous reports and also provides a fair representation of the status of the PMR evaluation for all four states when used in combination with the most recent state specific reports.³ In addition, at SBC’s request, on August 6, 2003, BearingPoint provided an updated Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003.

Based on this new information, BOC Applicants have updated their PMR4 and PMR5 analysis originally provided in Attachments B through F of the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit. A summary of BearingPoint’s August 1, 2003 Draft Report and of BOC Applicants’ revised attachments is provided below.⁴ The updated PMR4 and PMR5 attachments are attached hereto as Attachment Bv2 through Fv2.

The BearingPoint August 1, 2003, Illinois Draft Report

The first BearingPoint Interim Reports for Illinois and Ohio were released on December 20, 2002. The first Wisconsin Interim Report was released on January 15, 2003 and the first Indiana Interim Report was released on February 28, 2003. At the request of the various state commission, their staffs, and BOC Applicants, BearingPoint has periodically updated these reports. The most recent update provided is the Illinois report of August 1, 2003. The August 1, 2003 Draft Report provides an update of the test score based on test results as of July 16, 2003, unless otherwise noted in the report.

¹ See Ehr/Fioretti Joint Aff. ¶¶ 52-163 & Attachs. B-F (App. A, Tab 22).

² BearingPoint’s OSS Evaluation Project Report Metrics Update (August 1, 2003) (“August 1, 2003 Draft Report”). The August 1, 2003 Draft Report can also be found at www.osstesting.com

³ BearingPoint’s reports for Indiana (May 12, 2003), Wisconsin (June 30, 2003), and Ohio (June 30, 2003) can also be found at www.osstesting.com

⁴ Attachment Dv2, entitled “Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003,” was prepared by BearingPoint. Attachment Dv2 consists of four charts; one for each state, which are identified by the suffix to the attachment (Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI). A ‘match’ indicates that BearingPoint’s replication process has calculated a result within 1% of the result calculated and posted by SBC Midwest. See Ehr/Fioretti Joint Aff. ¶ 136.

Although PMR testing is not completed, the August 1, 2003 Draft Report shows continued progress in each area of the test, with the overall percentage of “Satisfied” test points continuing to increase and the percentage of “Not Satisfied” test points continuing to decrease. The report documents 270 applicable test points; 155 (57.4%) test points are “Satisfied,” 67 (24.8%) are considered “Not Satisfied,” and 48 (17.8%) are “Indeterminate.”⁵ The table below summarizes the most recent Illinois PMR results and provides an update as to the scoring of the component PMR categories. As the Illinois test report is the most recent, it provides the strongest indication of the test score across the SBC Midwest region.⁶ In order to provide a basis for comparison, BOC Applicants have also provided the most recent scoring for each of the four states in the chart below.

PMR Test Status									
PMR Section	PMR Report Status	IL 8/1/03	% Applicable Test Points	WI 6/30/03	% Applicable Test Points	OH 6/30/03	% Applicable Test Points	IN 5/12/0	% Applicable Test Points
PMR1	Satisfied	80	63.5%	85	67.5%	85	67.5%	65	50.8%
	Not Satisfied	27	21.4%	29	23.0%	29	23.0%	31	24.2%
	Indeterminate	19	15.1%	12	9.5%	12	9.5%	30	23.4%
	Not Applicable	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
PMR2	Satisfied	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3 ⁷	100.0%	3	100%
	Not Satisfied	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
	Indeterminate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
	Not Applicable	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
PMR3	Satisfied	29	100%	29	100%	29	100%	29	100%
	Not Satisfied	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
	Indeterminate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
	Not Applicable	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a

⁵ The PMR1 test shows continued good progress despite the change in status for fifteen test points. This change nets out to a difference of five fewer “Satisfied” test points (from 85 to 80), two fewer “Not Satisfied” test points (from 29 to 27), and seven additional “Indeterminate” (from 12 to 19) test points from the Ohio and Wisconsin 6/30/03 reports. A change to “Indeterminate” status typically indicates that additional testing is being conducted but is not yet complete.

⁶ “SBC Midwest” refers to Illinois Bell, Indiana Bell, Michigan Bell, Ohio Bell, and Wisconsin Bell.

⁷ Included from the May 23, 2003 report, which considers the PMR 2 and PMR 3 results among those described as “final for these aspects of the Ohio OSS test.”

PMR Test Status									
PMR Section	PMR Report Status	IL 8/1/03	% Applicable Test Points	WI 6/30/03	% Applicable Test Points	OH 6/30/03	% Applicable Test Points	IN 5/12/0	% Applicable Test Points
PMR4	Satisfied	13	32.5%	11	27.5%	11	27.5%	5	12.5%
	Not Satisfied	3	7.5%	3	7.5%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%
	Indeterminate	24	60.0%	26	65%	26	65.0%	26	65%
	Not Applicable	32	n/a	32	n/a	32	n/a	32	n/a
PMR5	Satisfied	30	41.7%	24	33.3%	24	33.3%	27	37.5%
	Not Satisfied	37	51.4%	37	51.4%	31	43.1%	26	36.1%
	Indeterminate	5	6.9%	11	15.3%	17	23.6%	19	26.4%
	Not Applicable	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
Total	Satisfied	155	57.4%	152	56.3%	152	56.3%	129	47.8%
	Not Satisfied	67	24.8%	69	25.6%	63	23.3%	66	24.4%
	Indeterminate	48	17.8%	49	18.1%	55	20.4%	75	27.8%
	Not Applicable	32	n/a	32	n/a	32	n/a	32	n/a

Data Integrity Analysis (PMR4) - Attachment Bv2

The Metrics Data Integrity (PMR4) test evaluates policies and practices used by SBC Midwest for processing the data used in the production of the reported performance results. Attachment B (PMR4 Analysis Exception Status as of 7/1/03) to the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit and paragraphs 98 through 113 in the Joint Affidavit detailed the status of the PMR 4 Exceptions, which affected the scoring of the June 30, 2003 PMR reports. There has been no change in the status of PMR4 test findings as of August 15, 2003, and accordingly Attachment Bv2 to this letter contains no updates. The status of the original five PMR 4 exceptions remains the same, with four closed and only one issue remaining open and in “Retest” status.⁸ The following table summarizes the status of the PMR4 findings.

⁸ Exceptions 181 and 182 apply to the same issue (PM 104.1). They were issued separately because the PSCW required the testing for Wisconsin specific PMR4 data samples rather than allowing for a regional test. For the purposes of this discussion they are referred to as “one” Exception since they reflect the same finding by BearingPoint and affect the reports in the same manner across the SBC Midwest region.

PMR 4 Analysis, Exception Status Summary as of 8/15/03		
Exception	Status as of 7/1/03	Status as of 8/15/03
E-181 (IL, IN, OH) E-182 (WI)	Retest	Retest
E-134	Closed, Satisfied ⁹	Closed, Satisfied
E-175	Closed, Not Satisfied ¹⁰	Closed, Not Satisfied
E-176	Closed, Satisfied	Closed, Satisfied
E-183	Closed, Satisfied	Closed, Satisfied

Metrics Calculations and Reporting (PMR5) -- Attachments Cv2-Fv2

In the Metrics Calculations and Reporting Test (PMR5), BearingPoint evaluates the processes used by SBC Midwest to calculate performance results, and it also assesses whether SBC Midwest has appropriately calculated those results in light of the state commission-approved business rules for each reported measure. Attachments C-F to the Ehr/Fioretti Joint affidavit addressed the three open PMR5 tests.¹¹

PMR5-2 Blind Replication Status Chart – Attachments Cv2 and Dv2

Attachments C and D to the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit are, respectively, BearingPoint letters dated June 27, 2003, and a BearingPoint chart entitled the “Blind Replication Status Summary as of June 4, 2003,” for each of the four states. Attachments Cv2 and Dv2 to this letter are updated versions of these documents.

Paragraphs 133 through 139 of the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit provide a detailed explanation as to the columns in Attachment D. A table following paragraph 138 depicts the relative number of “M” (match), “NM” (non-match), or “NMM” (non-material match) conditions that BearingPoint had identified through June 4, 2003. The table below provides an updated summary of this information, based on the updated BearingPoint charts included in Attachment Dv2.

⁹ Exception 134 was closed by BearingPoint in a “Satisfied” status on July 8, 2003.

¹⁰ Exception 175 was “Closed” by BearingPoint in a “Not Satisfied” status on July 22, 2003. The initial disposition report was posted on June 24, 2003, when BearingPoint initially proposed to close the finding. After the disposition report for this Exception was posted, SBC Midwest requested time to further discuss and consider retesting options related to this Exception. BearingPoint and SBC Midwest discussed retest options and were not able to develop specific retest plans. Therefore, BearingPoint had no further work to perform on this Exception Report and closed it on July 22. This Exception is discussed further at paragraphs 105 and 106 of the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit.

¹¹ PMR 5-1 has been fully satisfied.

Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003							
	Jul-02		Aug-02		Sep-02		Total
	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC and SBC
Match (M)							
Illinois	274 94.2%	169 96.0%	236 92.5%	134 96.4%	N/A ¹²	N/A	813 93.8%
Indiana	275 94.5%	138 98.6%	240 94.9%	102 100.0%	231 95.9%	102 100.0%	1088 96.4%
Ohio	273 92.5%	139 97.9%	234 92.1%	101 98.1%	228 95.4%	102 100.0%	1077 94.9%
Wisconsin	271 92.18%	134 94.37%	237 92.22%	102 92.73%	229 94.24%	102 92.73%	1075 93.0%
4-State	1093 93.3%	580 96.7%	947 92.9%	439 96.7%	688 95.2%	306 97.5%	4053 94.7%
Non-Material Match (NMM)							
Illinois	6 2.1%	0 0.0%	7 2.7%	2 1.4%	N/A	N/A	15 1.7%
Indiana	5 1.72%	0 0.00%	8 3.16%	0 0.00%	5 2.07%	0 0.00%	18 1.59%
Ohio	5 1.4%	1 3.6%	5 0.5%	2 0.0%	7 0.0%	0 0.0%	20 1.4%
Wisconsin	8 2.7%	6 4.2%	9 3.5%	8 7.3%	8 3.3%	8 7.3%	47 4.1%
4-State	24 2.0%	7 1.2%	29 2.8%	12 2.6%	20 2.8%	8 2.5%	100 2.3%
Non-Match (NM)							
Illinois	17 5.8%	7 4.0%	12 4.7%	3 2.2%	N/A	N/A	39 4.5%
Indiana	11 3.8%	2 1.4%	5 2.0%	0 0.0%	5 2.1%	0 0.0%	23 2.0%
Ohio	17 2.8%	2 5.1%	15 3.8%	0 0.0%	4 0.0%	0 0.0%	38 2.9%
Wisconsin	15 5.1%	2 1.4%	11 4.3%	0 0.0%	6 2.5%	0 0.0%	34 2.9%
4-State	60 5.1%	13 2.2%	43 4.2%	3 0.7%	15 2.1%	0 0.0%	134 3.1%

¹² The Illinois BearingPoint test requires that only two consecutive data months are replicated.

Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003							
	Jul-02		Aug-02		Sep-02		Total
	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC and SBC
Total Evaluated							
Illinois	297	176	255	139	N/A	N/A	867
Indiana	291	140	253	102	241	102	1129
Ohio	295	142	254	103	239	102	1135
Wisconsin	294	142	257	110	243	110	1156
4-State	1177	600	1019	454	723	314	4287

A comparison of the above tables to those in the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit at paragraph 138 shows that BearingPoint continues to replicate or “match” – at very high levels (ranging from 93.0% to 96.4 %) – the “key” measures, based on a 1% deviation standard. Of the additional 1257 sub-measures BearingPoint evaluated on a four-state basis between June 16 and July 30, 2003, 1204 of them (95.8% of the newly evaluated results) produced a “match” result within 1%. Of the remaining sub-measures, an additional 51 (4.1%) matched based on a 5% materiality threshold (i.e., “non-material matches”), accounting for a total match rate of over 97% (97.01% as of July 30, 2003) of the sub-measures evaluated to date on a four-state basis. Finally, the newly evaluated results identify only 2 “non-matches,” a mere 0.1% of the sub-measures examined during this most relevant period. The table indicates that BOC Applicants are maintaining a positive trend, as material replication of the “key measures” continues to perform above 95%.

PMR 5-2 Matrix – Attachment Ev2

Attachment E to the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit (PMR5-2 Analysis “NM” Issues from BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix), along with paragraphs 140 through 143 of the Joint Affidavit, detailed the status of the “key” measures that BearingPoint identified as “non-match” in Attachment D. BOC Applicants provide an updated Attachment Ev2 here, to reflect progress as of August 15, 2003. Pages with updates in Attachment Ev2 are identified as REVISED, and the updates are shown in red as either underlined or deleted text.

Attachment Ev2 documents modifications to the Status column and to the Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments column. As shown in Attachment Ev2, since July 1, 2003, six new PMR5-2 findings have been identified by BearingPoint as causes for “NM” conditions, but the analysis by BOC Applicants indicates that none of them affects performance results for the months of March – May 2003 filed with the Joint Application. In addition, four previous findings (NR 119, O-824, O-858, and O-862) have been “Closed, Satisfied.” The following tables summarize these status changes and new findings.

PMR5-2 Analysis “NM” Issues from BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix Summary as of 8/15/03		
Finding	Status as of 7/1/03	Status as of 8/15/03
NR119	Retest	Closed, Satisfied
O-824	Retest	Closed, Satisfied
O-858	Retest	Closed, Satisfied
O-862	Retest	Closed, Satisfied
NR132	New	Retest
O-664	New	Closed, Satisfied
O-642 ¹³	New	Closed Satisfied
O-710 ¹⁴	New	Retest
O-876	New	Retest
O-882	New	Retest

PMR 5-3 and 5-4 Matrix – Attachment Fv2

Attachment F to the Ehr/Fioretti Joint Affidavit (PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis from BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix), along with paragraphs 144 through 156 of the Joint Affidavit, detailed the status of the “key” measures that BearingPoint identified as either “Exclusion Discrepancies” or “Business Rule Discrepancies” in the Comments section of Attachment D. BOC Applicants provide an updated Attachment Fv2 here, to reflect progress as of August 15, 2003. Changes in Attachment Fv2 compared to Attachment F are again shown in red either as underlined or deleted text.

Attachment Fv2 provides information regarding updates to the “Current Status” column and to the “BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments” column, in instances where additional responses were made or issues have been identified since July 1, 2003. As shown in Attachment Fv2, eleven new PMR5-3 or PMR5-4 observations have been opened, but the analysis by BOC Applicants indicates that none of them materially affects performance results for the months of March – May 2003 filed with the Joint Application. Of these eleven new findings, seven are in “Retest,” one is “Closed, Satisfied,” and three are “Closed, Not Satisfied.” In addition, one existing finding is “Open” (O-729) pending SBC Midwest’s restatement evaluation. Finally, two existing findings (O-677 and O-739) have been “Closed, Satisfied,” and one existing finding (O-847) has been “Closed, Not Satisfied.”

¹³ Observation 642 is not a PMR5-2 related observation but was the cause of a restatement which, according to the BearingPoint methodology is the cause for the NM in the disaggregations associated with this finding.

¹⁴ Observation 710 is not a PRM5-2 related observation but was the cause of a restatement which, according to the BearingPoint methodology is the cause for the NM in the disaggregations associated with this finding.

The following tables summarize the status changes in PMR5-3 and 5-4 analysis matrices and the current status of the new findings.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis Matrix Changes Summary as of 8/15/03		
Current Status	Number of Findings ¹⁵ as of 7/1/03	Number of Findings as of 8/15/03
Open	0	1
Retest	18	21
Closed, Not Satisfied	30	34
Closed, Satisfied	8	11

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis New Issues Summary as of 8/15/03	
New Findings Since 7/1/03	Status as of 8/15/03
O-856	Retest
O-864	Closed, Not Satisfied
O-866	Closed, Not Satisfied
O-872	Retest
O-873	Retest
O-877	Closed, Not Satisfied
O-878	Retest
O-879	Closed, Satisfied
O-880	Retest
O-883	Retest
O-884	Retest

¹⁵ In cases where an Observation has been addressed with documentation only changes in the most recent six-month review, an observation is counted twice. It is counted once with the status of "Closed, Satisfied" in Illinois and Ohio which have directed BearingPoint to utilize business rules which incorporate these changes in their evaluation. It is also counted once with the status of "Closed, Not Satisfied" in Wisconsin and Indiana, which have not yet directed BearingPoint with regard to these business rules. There are 7 observations (O-628, 659, 711, 719, 722, 727, and 756) which are treated in this manner. These differences in status are also reflected in the most recent test reports.

ATTACHMENT B_v2

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

REVISED

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
Provisioning & Maintenance PMs E 134 No Material Impact⁵ < 5%	IL, IN, OH, WI PMR 4 (4-4-C, D, R)	Closed Satisfied⁶	<p><i>SBC Midwest incorrectly populated the product name field in the Regulatory Reporting System (RRS). The product name is populated as “UNKNOWN” for as many as 29,662 records in the <u>January 2002</u> version of the RRS “install_hicap_subrate_detail” table. BearingPoint has determined that the issues identified affect up to 25 performance measurements from the Ordering, Provisioning, Maintenance and Repair, and Other Measure Groups that use the Install HiCap Table or the Design Specials Inventory Table in conjunction with the Products Name Table (PMs 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 54.1 55, 55.1, 55.2, 55.3, 56, 56.1, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 10.4, MI2, WI1)</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest has taken a variety of corrective actions to address this issue in order to minimize the impact, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective with August 2002 results reported in September 2002, the RRS application (<i>install_hicap_subrate_detail table</i>) was updated to map, when appropriate, the previously identified unknown products and a process was implemented to ensure that new products were included in the product table. March through July 2002 results were restated in September 2002 and on October 7, 2002. This change also responded to E&Y’s Finding I-32⁷ for PMs 43-50, 52-54.1, 55-56.1, 58-63, 65-69, WI 1, WI 9, and CLEC WI 11. For the denominators of PMs 54 and 54.1 (for Resold Specials) as well as PMs 65 and 65.1 (for the retail equivalents), SBC Midwest implemented modifications to the Design Specials Inventory Table to address unmapped products in inventory (used in determining trouble report rate) effective with December 2002 results reported in January 2003. The source systems feed is in summary format using the product table to create the denominators. The prior months’ summaries do not contain the data at a level required to resolve the unknown products and thus the results cannot be restated. This change also responded to E&Y’s Finding III, 1⁸ for PMs 54, 54.1, 65 and 65.1.

¹ The PMs referenced in the finding, the BearingPoint Exception #, and SBC Midwest’s classification of the impact that the Exception has on results filed with the FCC for the months of March – May 2003.

² The SBC Midwest states for which the Exception is applicable and the specific test points associated with those SBC Midwest states.

³ This column represents the current status of the BearingPoint Exception as of August 15, 2003.

⁴ This section contains a brief description of the issue identified by BearingPoint in the Exception; a summary of the SBC Midwest investigation and corrective actions to address the Exception; and SBC Midwest’s comments on the impact of the Exception on the posted results for the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.

⁵ The term “No Material Impact” indicates that although there is an outstanding issue during the March, April, or May 2003 timeframe, it does not cause material differences in the aggregate performance results for the data filed with the FCC. For purposes of this analysis SBC Midwest use the same “materiality” standard that is used in its PM restatement guidelines. These guidelines are published on the SBC Midwest CLEC website at <https://pm.sbc.com/pm.cfm> as an addendum to SBC Midwest’s Performance Measurements Internal Change Management Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines. Under these PM restatement guidelines, an assessment of “materiality” is based on whether the recalculated data would result (a) in a shift in the performance in the aggregate from a “make” to a “miss” condition or (b) in a further degradation of reported performance of more than 5% for measures that are in a “miss” condition, provided there are at least 100 CLEC transactions in the sub-metric.

⁶ A status of “Closed Satisfied” describes a situation where SBC Midwest’s response to an Observation or Exception successfully resolved any issue that BearingPoint had with respect to the circumstances that generated the finding.

⁷ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section I #33.

⁸ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section III #5.

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the implementation of the revisions specified in CR071502, SBC Midwest determined that additional modifications would be needed for the Design Specials Inventory (PMs 54, 54.1, 65 and 65.1) due to the high number of remaining circuits identified as “UNKNOWN” and ER 1204 was opened to track these changes. ER1204 was implemented on a going forward basis with December 2002 results that were reported on 1/21/2003. In order to continually monitor the level of unmapped products, on a monthly basis a summary report is run which tracks the number of Unknown/Unmapped products in the installation and repair results. This report is forwarded to the Network group to review. The Network organization then does analysis and issues ERs as required to map the “Unknown” and therefore unmapped products to specific product names. Separately, BearingPoint also identified 182 items specified as “unknown products” in the HiCap Substrate Inventory Table – As these represent only a minute percentage (182 of 2,513,732 or .0072% of the records in this table) of the UNE Loop circuits in-service, SBC Midwest considers them immaterial and will continue to monitor the level through the monitor process. As part of the monitoring process, an enhancement ER was implemented for the May 2003 report (April 2003 results) to refine the current product identification; this date coincides with other ERs for new products. <p>SBC Midwest has implemented corrective actions to address the “UNKNOWN” product issue across the data in RRS used to report provisioning, maintenance, and other measure groups. A review of February 2003 results shows that “UNKNOWN” products identified in BearingPoint’s initial exception have been reduced to: .0184% of the total in the HiCap Substrate Inventory Table; 0.0203% in the HiCap Substrate Install Detail; less than 5.0% of the total in the Design Specials Inventory; and under 2.0% in the HiCap Substrate Repair Detail. The revision to the product identification processing for the Design Specials Inventory was implemented with January 2003 performance; it is this change that reduced the unknown product rate to less than 5.0%.</p> <p>SBC Midwest continues to monitor the level of “UNKNOWN” products in its results tables and believes that the impacts of these products remaining in its tables are even less material than described above. ER497 has been issued to resolve remaining issues with the product identification. Specific to the Design Specials Inventory, the revisions specified for ER 497 will reduce the number of unknown products to less than 0.5%. This revision is currently scheduled for June2003 results. It is important to note that even though the identification of products will be improving, the overall impact to the reported PM results will <u>not</u> be affected, since these particular “UNKNOWN” products are <u>not</u> products that are required to be reported for 271 performance results for either SBC Midwest retail or CLEC or are appropriately accounted for in other RRS tables, and therefore do <u>not</u> impact results. Additionally and in the same time frame, ER 497 will reduce unknown products in the HiCap Substrate Repair Detail to less than 1.0%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 30, 2003, BearingPoint posted a disposition report for Exception 134. It states: If implemented on a continuing basis, SBC Ameritech’s procedures for monitoring the assignment of “UNKNOWN” product names in the RRS system appear to present a reasonable framework for monitoring and addressing the “UNKNOWN” product name issue. The percentage of records in SBC Ameritech’s “Install_Hicap_Substrate_Detail” table with an “UNKNOWN” assigned in the “Product Name” field appears to be less than 1% for the June 2002 and July 2002 data months.

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discrepancies appeared between the “Product Name” field value in SBC Ameritech’s “Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail” table and the product name assigned by BearingPoint’s Test CLEC for certain records in the June 2002 and July 2002 data months. In these cases, BearingPoint analyzed whether the differing product names would have affected the assignment of the record to the applicable disaggregation(s) in the appropriate performance measure(s) during the results calculation process. BearingPoint determined that for approximately 95% of the Test CLEC records reviewed, SBC Ameritech’s product name assignment either matched the BearingPoint Test CLEC product name, or would not have affected the assignment of the particular record to the applicable disaggregation(s) in the appropriate performance measure(s) during the results calculation process. ○ BearingPoint continues to evaluate, through the Test CLEC component of PMR4, SBC Ameritech’s assignment of “Reported Product Name” and “Product Family” field values. The “Reported Product Name” and “Product Family” fields are also used to allocate individual RRS records to specific disaggregation(s) in applicable performance measure(s) during the results calculation process. ○ The percentage of records in SBC Ameritech’s Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail” table with an “UNKNOWN” assigned in the “Product Name” field appears to be less than 1% for the August and September, 2002 data months. ○ The percentage of records in SBC Ameritech’s “Design_Specials_Inventory” table with an “UNKNOWN” assigned in the “Product Name” field appears to be less than 1% for the February 2003 data month. <p>Based on these determinations, BearingPoint is closing this Exception.</p> <p>SBC Midwest implemented these computer programming changes and process enhancements for data months before February 2003 and, as described above, the remaining applicable unknown product issues are diminutive in nature. Therefore, this issue does not materially affect the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>Corrective actions for the issues identified by E&Y have been verified by E&Y.</p>

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
<p><i>PMs 114 & 115</i></p> <p><i>E 175</i></p> <p>No Impact⁹ (FDT)</p> <p>Interpretation¹⁰ (CHC)</p>	<p><i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i></p> <p>PMR4 (4-4-N)</p>	<p>Closed, Not Satisfied¹¹</p>	<p><i>SBC Midwest is using incorrect data in its calculation of Performance Measurements 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) and 115 (Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers) for the months of January through June 2002. BearingPoint identified two issues: First, SBC Midwest does not capture the start time of a Frame Due Time (FDT) cut, which should be used in the calculation of the FDT cut disaggregation for performance measurements 114 and 115 according to the business rules for each measure. Instead, SBC Midwest populates the start time with the scheduled start time. As a result, the FDT start times provided in SBC Midwest's performance measurement data will not match the BearingPoint CLEC FDT start times. Second, SBC Midwest captures the CLEC call to the Local Operations Center (LOC) as the start time of a Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) rather than the cutover time, which should be used in the calculation of the CHC disaggregation for performance measures 114 and 115 according to the business rules for these measures. As a result, the CHC start times provided in SBC Midwest's performance measurement data will not match the BearingPoint Test CLEC start times.</i></p> <p><i>This exception focuses on "Test CLEC" data collected during the operational test and therefore sample data is limited to the January – June 2002 time period.</i></p> <p><u>Frame Due Time Cuts</u> For PM 114: Effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002, SBC Midwest implemented a network process change to better capture the actual start times of coordinated cutovers (FDT). Prior to this change, the actual start time could not be derived from the source system. A revised method of reporting had been implemented in the reporting system for August 2002 results reported in September 2002. June 2002 and July 2002 results were restated on October 7, 2002.</p> <p>For PM 115: Effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002, the Company implemented an additional network process change to more precisely capture the actual start times coordinated cutovers (FDT). PM 115 was not restated for June 2002 through August 2002 as the process change could not be applied in arrears.</p> <p><u>Coordinated Hot Cut</u> For PM 114: This interpretation issue is fully described in SBC Midwest's February 18, 2003 response, as supplemented on May 20, 2003, to BearingPoint. SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint about the noted anomaly in the 'Definition' section of the "Ameritech Performance Measurement User Guide, Version 1.8_02_20_02" for PM 114 is inconsistent with the "Business Rules" section. The definition states that a premature disconnect occurs 10 minutes or more prior to the scheduled conversion. While the business rules states that a premature disconnect occurs 10 minutes or more prior to the CLEC "being on line". SBC Midwest will propose clarification of wording in the "Definition" of PM 114 to reflect the description of the Performance Measure Business Rule in the next</p>

⁹ An assessment of "No Impact" indicates that the issue has no effect on the posted results in the performance results for the data months of March – May 2003 filed with the FCC.

¹⁰ The "Interpretation" classification indicates that there is an issue related to this finding where BearingPoint is applying a different interpretation than what SBC Midwest has applied in its implementation.

¹¹ A Status of "Closed, Not Satisfied" indicates that BearingPoint has reviewed SBC Midwest's response and/or implementation of modifications and, the modifications were not implemented within each of the consecutive test months (July, August, and September 2002) under review by BearingPoint.

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴
			<p>scheduled 6-month review. Effective with the February 2003 results (reported in March) SBC Midwest enhanced the process of identifying premature conversions through the use of a jeopardy code.</p> <p>BearingPoint's disposition report reflects its agreement with the method that SBC implemented in February 2003. It states "If the new LOC procedures produce accurate results regarding whether a customer has been disconnected 10 or more minutes prior to a CLEC call time during a coordinated cutover, it would appear that SBC Ameritech would have a reasonable basis, including the required underlying data, for calculating Performance Measurement 114 consistently with the published metrics business rules."</p> <p><u>For PM 115:</u> The calculation SBC Midwest used to determine which specific disaggregation an "SBC Midwest Caused Delay" was reported in prior to April 2003 results was based on the use of "scheduled time" as the start time and the "CLEC call time" as the end time. SBC Midwest believes this is a reasonable interpretation of the business rules as currently written, and reflects the delay in <u>beginning a coordinated hot cut ("CHC")</u>. However, based on discussions with BearingPoint regarding the reporting of meaningful data to the CLECs, the SBC Midwest implementation has been modified to use the "CLEC call time" as the start time and "CLEC call back time" as the end time. This modification is effective with April, 2003 results (reported in May) and reflects the delay in completing a CHC, as opposed to the delay in beginning work on a CHC, which the original implementation measured. SBC Midwest believes that either method is appropriate, given the existing language in the business rules.</p> <p>Although the modified implementation does not precisely follow the business rule as written, SBC Midwest believes it provides a meaningful result with respect to the intent of the measure. SBC Midwest will propose changes to PM 115 Business Rules at <u>the next scheduled</u> six-month review collaborative to clarify the definition and description of the start time to be used in the calculation. It is important to note that in both implementations of the calculation of the duration, all "SBC Midwest Caused Delays" were reported with the difference only being the disaggregation in which they were reported.</p> <p>BearingPoint's disposition report reflects its agreement with the method that SBC implemented in April 2003, assuming collaborative approval of the proposed changes. It states "If approved by the collaborative and implemented consistently with SBC Ameritech's current assertions, these modifications would appear to provide a reasonable basis for measuring the underlying activities associated with coordinated conversions, and produce the necessary data for SBC Ameritech to calculate Performance Measurement 115 consistently with the published metrics business rules."</p> <p><u>CHC.</u> The logic described for Performance Measurements 114 and 115 is consistent with using the PM 114.1 "start time" definition for Coordinated Hot Cuts and is in accordance with the Commission-approved January 2002 business rules. In addition, SBC Midwest will propose business rule documentation changes for PM 114 and 115 to clarify these definition and descriptions in its next six-month review. The modification made to PM 115 is in agreement with the intent of the business rules and is reflective of an interpretation that the focus of the measure is to be "SBC Midwest Caused Delays". SBC Midwest believes that the reporting of CHC disaggregations in March, April, and May of 2003 for PMs 114 and 115 are based on reasonable interpretations of the business rules, which accurately reflect performance.</p>

¹² The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #47.

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴
			<p>SBC Midwest and BearingPoint continue to evaluate retest options. However, since this exception focuses on “Test CLEC” data collected during the operational test and the sample data is available only for the January – June 2002 time period in which “Test CLEC” data was collected, BearingPoint’s retest capability is significantly limited. Given that modifications to the business rules are also required in order for BearingPoint to render a positive opinion, a retest will likely not be conducted.</p> <p><u>FDT</u>. The process changes that SBC Midwest implemented in September 2002, with regard to the FDT disaggregations, ensure that this issue does not impact reported results going forward, including the 3 months of data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The FDT related issues in this Exception were addressed by E&Y in Section II, #48¹² and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">PM 19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">E 176</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No Impact</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PMR 4 (4-1-E, 4-4-E)</p>	<p>Closed Satisfied</p>	<p><i>SBC Midwest's March, April, and May 2002 performance measurement data is missing daily usage feed (DUF) records used in the calculation of Performance Measure 19 ("Daily Usage Feed Timeliness"). SBC Midwest was not including Category 11 records in the calculation of Performance Measure 19.</i></p> <p>PM 19 is designed to measure "Daily <u>Usage</u> Feed Timeliness". For this reason, SBC Midwest had been excluding "<u>access</u>" or category 11 records from reported results. Despite the fact that SBC Midwest disagrees with BearingPoint's interpretation of the measure, SBC Midwest agreed to modify its performance measurement data collection processes to collect data on DUF Category 11 files effective with December, 2002 data reported in January 2003 to comply with the BearingPoint interpretation of the business rules.</p> <p>No restatement is planned because the impact of this change on prior results is not material based on SBC Midwest restatement guidelines.¹³ The inclusion of Category 11 files substantially increases volumes reported, but does not materially impact the posted performance result. For example, Michigan's results for the three months after the implementation of the modifications to include these records remained in the 96-99% range (above the 95% benchmark) while the average volume for that same period increased nearly threefold (based on the inclusion of more records).</p> <p>In closing Exception 176, version 2, BearingPoint's disposition report of June 24, 2003 stated "BearingPoint reanalyzed SBC Ameritech's February 2003 data month, using volunteer CLEC data, to validate that SBC Ameritech now includes Category 11 DUF records in the processed performance measurement data for Performance Measurement 19. BearingPoint was able to match 100 percent of the Category 11 DUF records for all five states in SBC Ameritech's February 2003 Performance Measurement 19 processed data to the data provided by the volunteer CLEC. BearingPoint was able to match 100 percent of the Category 11 DUF records for Wisconsin in SBC Ameritech's February 2003 Performance Measurement 19 processed data to the data provided by the volunteer CLEC."</p> <p>December 2002 data results going forward agree with BearingPoint's interpretation of the business rules. Therefore, this issue has no impact to the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers indicate that E&Y did not consider Category 11 records to be required for inclusion in this PM and therefore it was not an audit issue.¹⁴</p>

¹³ See note 4 above.

¹⁴ Michigan Bell has tracked various BearingPoint and E&Y findings and work paper references. See. Ex Parte Letter of Geoffrey M. Klineberg on behalf of SBC to Marlene Dortch, FCC (March 28, 2003) at Attachment A, Exhibit 2 (PMR4) and Exhibit 3 (PMR5); see also, Report of Independent Accountants Dated March 31, 2003 (regarding these Michigan Bell's management assertions), Ex Parte Letter of Geoffrey M. Klineberg on behalf of SBC to Marlene Dortch, FCC (April 1, 2003).

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
<p>PM 104.1</p> <p>E 181¹⁵</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p><i>IL, IN, OH</i></p> <p>PMR 4 (4-3-J, 4-4-J)</p>	<p>Retest¹⁶</p>	<p><i>SBC Midwest's processed records for Performance Measure 104.1 ("The average time it takes to unlock the 911 record") appear to be inconsistent with the unprocessed records from SBC Midwest's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month. BearingPoint compared unprocessed data stored in SBC Midwest's source systems to the corresponding processed data, used in the replication of the performance measurement. BearingPoint compared a sample of 149 records from SBC Midwest's processed data used for the calculation of PM 104.1 to unprocessed data from SBC Midwest's MOR/Tel Database and UNLOK report for the month of January 2002 and found discrepancies.</i></p> <p>This issue is related solely to the reporting of performance measure results and not the actual operational process of unlocking 9-1-1 records. This issue relates to SBC Midwest being unable to match all 9-1-1 database unlock records (which reflect that an "unlock" has occurred) to completed service order records in the Company's systems in order to calculate the unlock interval.</p> <p>Three specific scenarios were identified in the records identified by Bearing Point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These records were attributed to human error on the part of SBC Midwest's 9-1-1 vendor, Intrado. These numbers were manually unlocked by analysts based on an incoming "Migrate" record from the CLECs. The analysts did not follow procedures by verifying ownership in NPAC prior to issuing the "record unlock". Corrective action was taken by reviewing procedures with the analysts to ensure understanding of the process. This issue was resolved in July 2002. Previous months were evaluated through SBC Midwest's Change Management process and it was determined that no results would be restated. • Prior to July, the Unlock file coming from Intrado did not contain any TN's that were manually "unlocked", it contained only those generated by service order. The process was changed in July 2002 to include all numbers manually unlocked. May and June 2002 results were restated to include these manual unlocks. Previous months were evaluated through SBC Midwest's Change Management process and it was determined that no results would be restated. • SBC Midwest implemented computer program code enhancements to improve the match rate between unlock records and service order completion data (ER1420), but additional program code enhancements were determined necessary. These enhancements were implemented for January 2003 results reported in February 2003. The impact was evaluated through SBC Midwest's Change Management process and it was determined that no results would be restated. SBC Midwest later decided to restate the July, August, and September 2002 data months in order to address BearingPoint test issues during the test period. These improvements bring the match rate up to approximately 95%. SBC Midwest continues to monitor and evaluate this process in order to find opportunities to further increase this rate. The 95% match rate applies only to the percentage of records selected for inclusion (based on different data sources) in the measurement in any particular month and does not reflect on the operational processes to unlock records. <p>In addition to the improvements made in July 2002 for PM 104.1, SBC Midwest implemented various process and system modifications to improve the match rate for service orders and unlocks effective with January 2003 data. Therefore, this issue has no impact to the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The match rate for unlocked records issue was addressed by E&Y in Section V, #13¹⁷ and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
<p>PM 104.1</p> <p>E 182¹⁸</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p>WI</p> <p>PMR 4 (4-3-J, 4-4-J)</p>	<p>Retest</p>	<p><i>SBC Ameritech's processed records for Performance Measure 104.1 ("The average time it takes to unlock the 911 record") appear to be inconsistent with the unprocessed records from SBC Ameritech's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month. BearingPoint compared a sample of 149 records from SBC Ameritech's processed data used for the calculation of performance measure 104.1 to SBC Ameritech's unprocessed data, which includes MOR/Tel Database data and the UNLOK report for the month of January 2002. All 149 records are expected to be within both the MOR/Tel data and the UNLOK report for January 2002. However, 110 of the records appear to be missing from MOR/Tel data and eight (8) appear to be missing from the UNLOK report.</i></p> <p>This issue is related solely to the reporting of performance measure results and not the actual operational process of unlocking 9-1-1 records. This issue relates to SBC Midwest being unable to match all 9-1-1 database unlock records (which reflect that an "unlock" has occurred) to completed service order records in SBC Midwest's systems in order to calculate the unlock interval.</p> <p>SBC Midwest implemented computer program code enhancements to improve the match rate between unlock records and service order completion data (ER1420), but additional program code enhancements were determined necessary. These enhancements were implemented for January 2003 results reported in February 2003. The impact was evaluated through SBC Midwest's Change Management process and it was determined that no results would be restated. SBC Midwest later decided to restate the July, August, and September 2002 data months in order to address BearingPoint test issues during the test period. These improvements bring the match rate up to approximately 95%. SBC Midwest continues to monitor and evaluate this process in order to find opportunities to further increase this rate. The 95% match rate applies only to the percentage of records selected for inclusion (based on different data sources) in the measurement in any particular month and does not reflect on the operational processes to unlock records.</p> <p>In addition to the improvements made in July 2002 for PM 104.1, SBC Midwest implemented various process and system modifications to improve the match rate for service orders and unlocks effective with January 2003 data. Therefore, this issue has no impact to the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y addressed the match rate for the unlocked records issue in Section III, #7 and verified the corrective actions.</p>

¹⁵ Exception 181 concerns PM 104.1 in IL, IN, MI, and OH while E-182 was issued relating to the same issues for PM 104.1 in WI

¹⁶ A Status of "Retest" indicates that SBC Midwest has responded to BearingPoint's issues and is awaiting their review of the response and subsequent retesting of the finding.

¹⁷ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana E&Y attachments in Section III #7.

¹⁸ Exception 182 concerns PM 104.1 in WI while E-181 was issued relating to the same issues for PM 104.1 in IL, IN, MI, and OH

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴</i>
PM MI 11 E 183 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 4 (4-1-R)	Closed, Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's performance measurement data appears to be missing interface outage notifications used in the calculation of Performance Measurement MI 11 ("Average Interface Outage Notification") for the months of January, March, April, and May 2002. Version 2 identified six additional items for September 2002 through December 2002.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest has identified all of the items BearingPoint listed as missing from the log in the original version of E-183 and later in version 2. There are six common reasons for BearingPoint's inability to identify these outage notifications in the performance measurement data:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BearingPoint's process was erroneously not looking for the "Time of Notification" as stored in the actual e-mail notification. 2. The outage was correctly not included in the restatement data because all outages that were not 'initial' are not reported. This issue was also addressed by E&Y in section I, # 51. 3. The outage was removed from the restatement data incorrectly due to manual processing errors. 4. The date and or time of notification are incorrect on the restatement data log due to manual processing errors. This issue was also addressed by E&Y in Section E&Y II, 52.¹⁹ 5. BearingPoint did not recognize that original system noticed was not the same as the one listed on interface outage log due to later identification of a root cause in a different system. However, these outages were tracked and results were reported. 6. Human error on the part of the problem managers caused the outage notice to be omitted from the log. <p>SBC Midwest implemented process enhancements to reduce the manual errors identified in items 3, 4, and 6 above. As of September 2002, the Broadcast Fax manager crosschecks the problem manager logs to ensure appropriate recording of e-mail times. In addition, beginning in January 2003, the Senior Business Manager of Interconnection Compliance Support is also reviewing each entry against e-mail notifications as a secondary check.</p> <p>BearingPoint's version 2 Exception 183 includes a review of data from the period spanning September through December of 2002, although SBC Midwest's corrective action was not completely implemented until January 2003. SBC Midwest requested that BearingPoint retest a period that includes the corrective action.</p> <p>BearingPoint posted a disposition report on June 5, 2003, which stated: "SBC Ameritech's April 11, 2003 response to Exception Report 183, version 2 stated that additional and new processes were implemented in both the September 2002 and January 2003 to reduce the number of manual errors that occurred when logging initial interface outage notifications.</p> <p>In retesting this Exception Report, BearingPoint monitored the initial interface outage notifications SBC Ameritech sent to the BearingPoint Test, CLEC between January 2003 and April 2003. All of the 21 initial interface outage notifications received by the Test CLEC during that period were also found in SBC Ameritech's performance</p>

¹⁹ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #51.

PMR 4 Analysis
Exception Status as of 8/15/03

<i>PM Exception# Impact¹</i>	<i>States, Test Points²</i>	<i>Exception Status³</i>	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments⁴
			<p>measurement data.</p> <p>BearingPoint has determined that the issue raised in this Exception Report has been addressed.”</p> <p>The process improvements implemented by SBC Midwest were effective with January 2003 data. Therefore, this issue has no impact to the February – April 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The second issue noted above was addressed by E&Y in Section I, #51, while the fourth was addressed in E&Y in Section II, #52²⁰ and both corrective actions have been verified.</p>

²⁰ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #51.

ATTACHMENT Cv2



One Radnor Corporate Center
100 Matsonford Road
Radnor, PA 19087
Tel: +1.610.263.8000
www.bearingpoint.com

August 6, 2003

Mr. John Hudzik
Vice President, Long Distance Compliance
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
4G42
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

RE: FCC REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Hudzik:

BearingPoint, Inc. worked with SBC to develop the *Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003*. This summary reflects the status of work for the applicable components of the Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation Review test being conducted for the ICC.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Eringis".

John Eringis
Managing Director
BearingPoint, Incorporated



One Radnor Corporate Center
100 Matsonford Road
Radnor, PA 19087
Tel: +1.610.263.8000
www.bearingpoint.com

August 6, 2003

Mr. John Hudzik
Vice President, Long Distance Compliance
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
4G42
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

RE: FCC REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Hudzik:

BearingPoint, Inc. worked with SBC to develop the *Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003*. This summary reflects the status of work for the applicable components of the Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation Review test being conducted for the IURC.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Eringis".

John Eringis
Managing Director
BearingPoint, Incorporated



One Radnor Corporate Center
100 Matsonford Road
Radnor, PA 19087
Tel: +1.610.263.8000
www.bearingpoint.com

August 6, 2003

Mr. John Hudzik
Vice President, Long Distance Compliance
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
4G42
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

RE: FCC REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Hudzik:

BearingPoint, Inc. worked with SBC to develop the *Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003*. This summary reflects the status of work for the applicable components of the Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation Review test being conducted for the PUCO.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Eringis".

John Eringis
Managing Director
BearingPoint, Incorporated



One Radnor Corporate Center
100 Matsonford Road
Radnor, PA 19087
Tel: +1.610.263.8000
www.bearingpoint.com

August 6, 2003

Mr. John Hudzik
Vice President, Long Distance Compliance
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
4G42
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

RE: FCC REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Hudzik:

BearingPoint, Inc. worked with SBC to develop the *Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003*. This summary reflects the status of work for the applicable components of the Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation Review test being conducted for the PSCW.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Eringis".

John Eringis
Managing Director
BearingPoint, Incorporated

ATTACHMENT Dv2

Legend for the Illinois Blind Replication* Status Summary as of July 30, 2003**

Attachment Dv2-IL

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8 (modified). (On July 10, 2003, BearingPoint was instructed by ICC staff to use a modified version of the published metrics business rules v1.8 to execute the Illinois PMR5 test.)		
Product Disaggregation	The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8 (modified). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.		Example: % Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work
July 2002, August 2002 <i>The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002 and August 2002 data months.</i>	CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive). SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Illinois. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

* "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."

** Blind replication status is reported as of July 30, 2003, unless otherwise noted.

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING

1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING

5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
 7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
 9 - Percent Rejects
 10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
 10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
 10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
 10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
 10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
 11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
 11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
 11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
 13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING

12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
 27 - Mean Installation Interval
 28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
 29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
 35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
 45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
 56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
 56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
 58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
 37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
 38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
 39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
 40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
 41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
 54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
 67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING

14 - Billing Accuracy
 17 - Billing Completeness
 18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
 19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS

73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
 78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
 96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE

110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION

114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
 114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
 115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
 115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
 MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER

MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
 MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
 MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
 MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Pre-Ordering Metrics									
1.2 ⁵ - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved); O856
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved)
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0			
Ordering Metrics									
5 ⁴ - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) <= 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	53	MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	54	MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	107	ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	108	ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		
7 ⁵ - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O787, O854
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
9 ⁴ - Percent Rejects									
	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
10 ⁴ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR									Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
10 ⁴ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR									Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR132 Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS					In Progress		
10.1 ⁹ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order									
	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel					Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR137 Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.2 ⁹ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours									
	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel					Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.3 ⁹ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and									
	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel					Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Returned Within Five Hours	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.4 ⁶ - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work	NMM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work	NM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work	NM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work	NM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Calculation Discrepancies: O882
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work	NM				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP	NM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP	NM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
11 ⁴ - Mean Time to Return Rejects	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS					Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
11.1 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel					Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), Exclusion Discrepancies: O755

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷				Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
11.2 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel					Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS			NMM ⁷		Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
13 ⁴ - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			6	0	0	0			
Provisioning Metrics									
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	
	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
27 - Mean Installation Interval (Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M		In Progress		
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M			In Progress		
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M		In Progress		
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M			In Progress		
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M			In Progress		
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M			In Progress		
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M			In Progress		
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M			In Progress		
	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M			In Progress		
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M			In Progress		
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M			In Progress		
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M			In Progress		
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M			In Progress		
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M			In Progress		
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M			In Progress		
	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M			In Progress		
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M			In Progress		
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M			In Progress		
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (1-10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing	M	M ⁸	M	M ⁸	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects	M	M	M	M	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects	M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M			In Progress		
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M			In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M			In Progress		
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	NM	M			In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁶			In Progress		
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line sharing	M				In Progress		
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M			In Progress		
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M			In Progress		
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	NM	M			In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M			In Progress		
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁶			In Progress		
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/out Line sharing	NMM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M			In Progress		
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M			In Progress		
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M			In Progress		
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M			In Progress		
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			3	0	0	0			
Maintenance and Repair Metrics									
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	M	M			In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NMM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM ⁷	NM	NM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM ⁷	NM	NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	285	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	M	M	NMM ⁷	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	NM ⁷	M	NM ⁷	Completed	7/29/2003	
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			5	7	3	3			
Billing Metrics									
14 - Billing Accuracy	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003	
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003	
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/30/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O731 (closed unresolved)
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)		Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS							Business Rule Discrepancies: O864 (closed unresolved)
	340		M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O694v2 (closed unresolved), O846 (closed unresolved)
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0			
Interconnection Trunk Metrics									
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
78 - Average	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/9/2003	

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/9/2003	
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/9/2003	
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/9/2003	
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0			
LNP Metrics									
91 ⁵ - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732 Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partial - NXX (1-100 TNs)					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732 Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	M		M		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M		M		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0				
Directory Assistance Database Metrics									
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs - Electronic	M	M	M	M	Completed	2/19/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O689 (closed unresolved)
	357	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs - Manual	M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O689 (closed unresolved)
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0			
Coordinated Conversions Metrics									
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)	358	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	359	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	361	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	
	363	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)

Illinois Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IL

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O872, O873
	371	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM ⁷		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O873
MI3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval									
	372	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved); O878 Exclusion Discrepancies: O877, O879, O880
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		7				
Other Metrics									
MI 9 ⁵ - Percentage Missing FOCs	373	% Missing FOCs - Resale					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	375	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI11 - Average Interface Outage Notification									
	376	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O624v2 (closed unresolved), O594 (closed unresolved)
MI 13 ⁶ - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	380	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	381	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	382	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour	M				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O876 Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
	383	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	384	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
	385	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	386	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour					In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			2		2				
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			17	7	12	3			

Footnotes:

1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate"
9. The reporting of this performance measurement, subsequent to 6/5/03, occurred out of both MOR/Tel and ICS/DSS system. On 6/5/03, SBC restated this performance measurement and transitioned the calculation to ICS/DSS entirely.

Legend for the Indiana Blind Replication* Status Summary as of July 30, 2003**

Attachment Dv2-IN

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8.		
Product Disaggregation	<p>The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8.</p> <p>This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.</p>		<p>Example:</p> <p>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work</p>
<p>July 2002, August 2002, September 2002</p> <p><i>The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 data months.</i></p>	<p>CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive).</p> <p>SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive).</p> <p>This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Indiana. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)</p>	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

* "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."

** Blind replication status is reported as of July 30, 2003, unless otherwise noted.

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING

1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING

5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
9 - Percent Rejects
10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING

12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
27 - Mean Installation Interval
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING

14 - Billing Accuracy
17 - Billing Completeness
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS

73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE

110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION

114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER

MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Pre-Ordering Metrics											
1.2 ⁵ - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved); O856
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M						In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved)
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Ordering Metrics											
5 ⁴ - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	53	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	54	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (≥ 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	107	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	108	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
7 ^b - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O787, O854
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
9 ^d - Percent Rejects	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
10 ⁴ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS					NM		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancy: NR132 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
10.1 ⁵ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR137 Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.2 ⁵ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.3 ⁵ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.4 ⁵ - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work	NMM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O687v2, O725 Exclusion Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	11 ¹ - Mean Time to Return Rejects										
	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
11.1 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	11.2 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process										
	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
13 ¹ - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		NMM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O838 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: U488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			2	0	0	0	1	0			
Provisioning Metrics											
(Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	
	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	M	M		M	M	M	In Progress		
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	M	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line Sharing	M						In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	NM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops/w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			2	0	0	0	0	0			
Maintenance and Repair Metrics											
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	NMM ⁷	M			NM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NM ⁷	M	NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM ⁷	NM	NM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM ⁷	NM	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	285	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
(Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/29/2003	
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			5	2	2	0	2	0			

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Billing Metrics											
14 - Billing Accuracy	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003	
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003	
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/30/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O731 (closed unresolved)
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)		Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS									Business Rule Discrepancies: O864 (closed unresolved)
	340		M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O694v2 (closed unresolved), O846 (closed unresolved)
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Interconnection Trunk Metrics											
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M		M		NMM ⁷		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
LNP Metrics											
91 ⁵ - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partial - NXX (1-100 TNs)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M		M		M		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		1		0				
Directory Assistance Database Metrics											
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	M		M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
Coordinated Conversions Metrics											
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)	357	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	358	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
114.1 - CHC/FDT	359	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	361	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	363	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved); O872; O873
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved); O873
MI3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval	371	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved); O878 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O877; O879; O880
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
Other Metrics											
MI 9 ⁵ - Percentage Missing FOCs	372	% Missing FOCs - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	373	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI11 - Average Interface Outage Notification	375	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O624v2 (closed unresolved), O594 (closed unresolved)
MI 13 ⁵ - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	376	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	380	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2 Calculation Discrepancies: O876
	381	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour	M						In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved) Calculation Discrepancies: O849
	382	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	NMM		NMM ⁷		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	383	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)

Indiana Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-IN

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	384	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	385	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			2		2		2				
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			11	2	5	0	5	0			

Footnotes:

1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate" values.
9. The reporting of this performance measurement, subsequent to 6/5/03, occurred out of both MOR/Tel and ICS/DSS system. On 6/5/03, SBC restated this performance measurement and transitioned the calculation to ICS/DSS entirely.

Legend for the Ohio Blind Replication* Status Summary as of July 30, 2003**

Attachment Dv2-OH

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8 (modified). (On June 5, 2003, BearingPoint was instructed by PUCO staff to use a modified version of the published metrics business rules v1.8 to execute the Ohio PMR5 test.)		
Product Disaggregation	The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8 (modified). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.		Example: % Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work
July 2002, August 2002, September 2002 <i>The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 data months.</i>	CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive). SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Ohio. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

* "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."

** Blind replication status is reported as of July 30, 2003, unless otherwise noted.

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING

1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING

5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
9 - Percent Rejects
10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING

12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
27 - Mean Installation Interval
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING

14 - Billing Accuracy
17 - Billing Completeness
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS

73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE

110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION

114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER

MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Pre-Ordering Metrics											
1.2 ⁵ - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved); O856
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M						In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved)
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Ordering Metrics											
5 ⁴ - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		In Progress	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	53	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	54	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (≥ 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	107	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	108	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
7 ^b - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O787, O854
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
9 ^a - Percent Rejects	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS							Not Started		

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
10 ⁴ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS					NMM		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR132 Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
10.1 ⁵ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR137 Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.2 ⁶ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.3 ⁸ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.4 ⁶ - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
11 ¹ - Mean Time to Return Rejects	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
11.1 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
11.2 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
13 ¹ - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		NMM				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O838 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: U488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			7	0	0	0	0	0			
Provisioning Metrics											
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	
27 - Mean Installation Interval (Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M				In Progress		
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M				In Progress		
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M					In Progress		
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M					In Progress		
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M					In Progress		
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M					In Progress		
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M					In Progress		
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M					In Progress		
	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M					In Progress		
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (1-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O729

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M					In Progress		
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M					In Progress		
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	M	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M					In Progress		
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	NMM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M					In Progress		
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M					In Progress		
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M					In Progress		
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M					In Progress		
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			1	0	0	0	0	0			
Maintenance and Repair Metrics											
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NMM ⁷	M			NM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	NM ⁷	M	NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NMM ⁷	M	NM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NM	M	NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0627v3
	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	NM ⁷	M	NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM ⁷	NM	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM ⁷	NMM	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM	NM	NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0639v3
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	285	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	NMM ¹	M	NMM ¹	M	NMM ¹	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			6	2	5	0	2	0			
Billing Metrics											
14 - Billing Accuracy	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003	
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003	
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/30/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O731 (closed unresolved)
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)		Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS									Business Rule Discrepancies: O864 (closed unresolved)
	340		M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O694v2 (closed unresolved), O846 (closed unresolved)
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Interconnection Trunk Metrics											
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M		M		NMM ⁷		Completed	7/9/2003	
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
LNP Metrics											
91 ⁶ - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industrv	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732 Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Guidelines (Evaluated as of 6/6/03)	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partial - NXX (1-100 TNs)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732 Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	M		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M		M		M		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		1		1				
Directory Assistance Database Metrics											
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	M		M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O689 (closed unresolved)
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
Coordinated Conversions Metrics											
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)	357	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusions Discrepancies: O880
	358	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	359	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	361	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	363	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusions Discrepancies: O880
	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusions Discrepancies: O880
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusions Discrepancies: O880
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved)
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved); O872; O873
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved); O873
MI3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval	371	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O878 Exclusions Discrepancies: O877, O879, O880
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		7		0				
Other Metrics											

Ohio Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-OH

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
MI 9 ⁵ - Percentage Missing FOCs	372	% Missing FOCs - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	373	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI11 - Average Interface Outage Notification	375	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O624v2 (closed unresolved), O594 (closed unresolved)
MI 13 ⁵ - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	376	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	380	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2 Calculation Discrepancies: O876
	381	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour	M		M		NM		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
	382	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	383	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
	384	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	385	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			2		2		2				
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			17	2	15	0	5	0			

Footnotes:

1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate" values.
9. The reporting of this performance measurement, subsequent to 6/5/03, occurred out of both MOR/Tel and ICS/DSS system. On 6/5/03, SBC restated this performance measurement and transitioned the calculation to ICS/DSS entirely.

Legend for the Wisconsin Blind Replication* Status Summary as of July 30, 2003**

Attachment Dv2-WI

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8.		
Product Disaggregation	<p>The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8.</p> <p>This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.</p>		<p>Example:</p> <p>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work</p>
<p>July 2002, August 2002, September 2002</p> <p><i>The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 data months.</i></p>	<p>CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive).</p> <p>SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive).</p> <p>This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Wisconsin. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)</p>	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

* "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."

** Blind replication status is reported as of July 30, 2003, unless otherwise noted.

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING

1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING

5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
 7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
 9 - Percent Rejects
 10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
 10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
 10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
 10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
 10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
 11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
 11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
 11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
 13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING

12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
 27 - Mean Installation Interval
 28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
 29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
 35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
 45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
 56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
 56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
 58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
 37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
 38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
 39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
 40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
 41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
 54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
 67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING

14 - Billing Accuracy
 17 - Billing Completeness
 18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
 19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS

73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
 78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
 96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE

110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION

114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
 114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
 115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
 115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
 MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER

MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
 MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
 MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
 MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
Pre-Ordering Metrics											
1.2 ⁵ - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved); O856
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M						In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O697 (closed unresolved)
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Ordering Metrics											
5 ⁴ - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	53	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	54	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Te	M		M		M		Completed	6/15/2003	
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (≥ 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (≥ 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Exclusion Discrepancies: O787
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	107	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	108	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		
7 ^b - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O787, O854
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O854
9 ^a - Percent Rejects	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M				Completed	6/15/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O688v2 (closed unresolved)
10 ⁴ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS					NM		In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR132 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O803 (closed unresolved)
10.1 ⁹ - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷				In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: NR137 Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.2 ³ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.3 ⁹ - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
10.4 ⁵ - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P	NM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O882 Business Rule Discrepancies: O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O687v2, O725
	11 ⁴ - Mean Time to Return Rejects										
	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 Exclusion Discrepancies: O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)
11.1 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS			NMM ⁷				Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
11.2 ⁹ - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel							Completed	7/7/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS	NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷				Not Started		Business Rule Discrepancies: O727 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O755
13 ⁴ - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O866 Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: U488v3 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O746 (closed unresolved)
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			5	0	0	0	1	0			
Provisioning Metrics											
(Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O794 (closed unresolved)
	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O883
	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M				In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O628v2 (closed unresolved)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	In Progress		
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	M	M ⁵	In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects	M		M		M		Completed	3/26/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: 0729
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	NM	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	M	M					In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: 0613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M ⁵					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: 0711 (closed unresolved)

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loopsw/out Line sharing	NMM						In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O613v4 Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M					In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O711 (closed unresolved)
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			2	0	0	0	0	0			
Maintenance and Repair Metrics											
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷	M	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O627v3
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Install and Repeat Reports	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		
	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	NM ⁷	NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM ⁷	NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		NMM ⁷	In Progress		Calculation Discrepancies: O639v3
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/27/2003	
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
	285	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/8/2003	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 8/4/03)	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O884
	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O884
	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O884
	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/31/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O884
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/21/2003	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷	M	NMM ⁷	Completed	7/28/2003	
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/28/2003	
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M		M		M		Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	7/3/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: E111 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value1			
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			3	2	2	0	1	0			
Billing Metrics											
14 - Billing Accuracy	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003	
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs									
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O731 (closed unresolved)
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)		Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS									Business Rule Discrepancies: O864 (closed unresolved)
	340		M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Exclusions Discrepancies: O845 (closed unresolved)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O894v2 (closed unresolved), O846 (closed unresolved)
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0			
Interconnection Trunk Metrics											
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003	
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M		M		NM ⁷		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M		M		M		Completed	7/9/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O719 (closed unresolved)
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		1				
LNP Metrics											
91 ⁹ - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partial - NXX (1-100 TNs)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M		NMM ⁷		NM ⁷		Completed	7/16/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O710
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		1		2				
Directory Assistance Database Metrics											
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	M		M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	Exclusion Discrepancies: O689 (closed unresolved)
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0				
Coordinated Conversions Metrics											
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)	357	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	358	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NM ⁷		Completed	7/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	359	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O880
	361	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	363	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved), O677v2 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O880
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O570v2 (closed unresolved) Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved)
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved); O872; O873
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved); O872; O873
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM ⁷		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Exclusion Discrepancies: O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved); O873
M13 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval	371	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	Business Rule Discrepancies: O631v2 (closed unresolved); O878 Exclusion Discrepancies: O722 (closed unresolved); O877; O879; O880
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		6		1				
Other Metrics											
MI 9 ⁵ - Percentage Missing FOCs	372	% Missing FOCs - Resale							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	373	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O792 Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
M11 - Average Interface Outage Notification	375	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	Business Rule Discrepancies: O624v2 (closed unresolved), O594 (closed unresolved)
MI 13 ⁵ - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	376	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P							In Progress		Exclusion Discrepancies: O661v2, O787
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	380	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2 Calculation Discrepancies: O876
	381	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour	NM		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
	382	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	M		M		M		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	383	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)

Wisconsin Blind Replication Status Summary as of July 30, 2003

Attachment Dv2-WI

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status ²	Complete Date	Comments ³
			CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹	CLEC Value ¹	SBC Midwest Value ¹			
	384	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	NM ⁷		NM ⁷		NMM ⁷		In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O642v2, O847 Exclusion Discrepancies: O637v2
	385	% Cmpltn Nofctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		Business Rule Discrepancies: O847, O848 (closed unresolved)
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			3		2		0				
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			15	2	11	0	6	0			

Footnotes:

1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate" values.
9. The reporting of this performance measurement, subsequent to 6/5/03, occurred out of both MOR/Tel and ICS/DSS system. On 6/5/03, SBC restated this performance measurement and transitioned the calculation to ICS/DSS entirely.

ATTACHMENT Ev2

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Pre-Ordering Metrics			
PM 1.2 NR 119 No Impact ⁶	IL, IN, OH, WI	Retest⁷ Closed Satisfied⁸	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 1.2 (“Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually (REF #1) – IN, WI - Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically (REF #2) – IL, OH <p>SBC Midwest has determined that BearingPoint was not using the correct version of the technical documentation (BTR) for replicating PM 1.2. SBC Midwest provided the correct version of the BTR to BearingPoint on May 29, 2003. SBC Midwest fully expects that BearingPoint will be able to successfully replicate PM1.2 when using the correct documentation.</p> <p>SBC Midwest believes the issue related to NR 119 is solely caused by BearingPoint’s use of an incorrect version of documentation in its replication activities for this PM. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. <u>As confirmed with the closing of NR119 as “Satisfied”, the items identified in NR119 did not represent actual issues with SBC Midwest’s performance measurement calculations.</u></p>

¹ In addition to the observations, exceptions, and notification requests (O/E/NR) listed on this chart that resulted in Non-Match (“NM”) status, the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachments D-IL, D-IN, D-OH, D-WI) contains five other PMR5-2 Observations and two Notification Reports (O664v2, O805, O817, O838, O849, NR117, and NR118). These seven items are not listed on this report because they did not result in “NM” status. Although, these observations have been resolved, they will remain outstanding until BearingPoint completes the PMR5 testing associated with these PMs.

² The impacted performance measure; the related BearingPoint (O/E/NR); and SBC Midwest’s classification of the impact that the O/E/NR has on results filed with the FCC for the months of March - May 2003.

³ The SBC Midwest states for which the O/E/NR is applicable.

⁴ This column represents the status of the BearingPoint Observation, Exception, or Notification Request as of August 15, 2003, unless otherwise noted.

⁵ The specific BearingPoint issue affecting the performance measure and an itemized list of each disaggregation marked as a “NM” Non-Match with related SBC Midwest comments.

⁶ An assessment of “No Impact” indicates that the issue had no effect on the posted results for the data months March, April, or May 2003 filed with the FCC.

⁷ A Status of “Retest” indicates that SBC Midwest has responded to BearingPoint issues and is awaiting their review of the response and retest of the finding.

⁸ A status of “Closed Satisfied” describes a situation where SBC Midwest’s response to an Observation, Exception, or Notification Report successfully resolved any issue that BearingPoint had with respect to the circumstances that generated the finding

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)**REVISED**

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Ordering Metrics			
<u>PM 10</u> <u>NR132</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IN, WI</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest's September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 10 ("Percentage Mechanized Rejects returned Within 1 hour of receipt of reject in MOR").</i></u></p> <p><u>- % Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR – ICS/DSS (REF #119) – IN, WI</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest identified the following two reasons that explain the discrepancy between SBC Midwest's posted results and BearingPoint's replication attempt:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. BearingPoint's replication attempt does not exclude ACNAs that are appropriate to exclude.</u> <u>2. BearingPoint's replication attempt does not properly exclude orders that are in the Order Revision table that have an entry type of manual for an outbound 860. This exclusion can be found in the code provided to BearingPoint for Performance Measure 10.</u> <p><u>SBC Midwest fully expects that BearingPoint will be able to successfully replicate PM10 when the two items above are corrected.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes the issue related to NR 132 is caused by improper exclusions made by BearingPoint. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 10.4 O882 No Impact	<u>IL, IN,</u> <u>OH, WI</u>	Retest	<p><u><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices").</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Residential – Field Work (REF #126) – IN, OH, WI</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Residential – No Field Work (REF #127) – IL, OH, WI</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Business – Field Work (REF #128) – IL, OH</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Business – No Field Work (REF #129) – IL, OH</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Resale Special – No Field Work (REF #131) – IL</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Unbundled Loop with LNP (REF #132) – IL, OH, WI</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – Unbundled Loop without LNP (REF #133) – IL, IN, OH, WI</u> - <u>% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices – POTS – UNE-P (REF #135) – OH, WI</u> <p><u>SBC Midwest identified the following reasons that explain the discrepancy between SBC Midwest's posted results and BearingPoint's replication attempt:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The SBC Midwest posted results use the revised order schedule date in certain circumstances as outlined in the technical documentation in Section 4.1.4. The BearingPoint replication attempt appears to incorrectly use the original order schedule date in these circumstances.</u> ▪ <u>The SBC Midwest posted results includes one occurrence of the same ord_msg number. The BearingPoint replication attempt includes multiple occurrences of the same ord_msg number.</u> ▪ <u>The SBC Midwest posted results excludes customer caused jeopardies as outlined in the technical documentation in Section 3.1.4.6. The BearingPoint replication attempt does not.</u> ▪ <u>The SBC Midwest posted results includes all jeopardies that are sent within the report month, specifically Jul'02, as outlined in the technical documentation in Section 3.1.3.1. The BearingPoint replication attempt only includes jeopardies where the associated order's scheduled due date is in the report month, specifically Jul'02.</u> ▪ <u>The SBC Midwest posted results includes orders that the BearingPoint replication does not.</u> <p><u>SBC Midwest fully expects that BearingPoint will be able to successfully replicate PM10.4 when these items are corrected.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes the issue related to O 882 is caused by improper exclusions made by BearingPoint. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Provisioning Metrics			
PM 35 NR126 No Impact	WI	Closed Satisfied ⁹	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – POTS – Bus – FW (REF #182) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – POTS – Bus – No FW (REF #183) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – POTS – Res – FW (REF #184) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – POTS – Res – No FW (REF #185) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – UNE-P – Bus – FW (REF #186) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – UNE-P – Bus – No FW (REF #187) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – UNE-P – Res – FW (REF #188) – WI - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install – UNE-P – Res – No FW (REF #189) – WI <p>All discrepancies noted in NR 126 are the result of BearingPoint excluding records from the numerator if the Service Type Code is less than 10. These records should be included in Residence (“04”) and Business (“05”, “06”, and “07”) disaggregations as detailed in our Business Technical Requirements for Performance Measure 35. SBC was able to reproduce BearingPoint’s results in NR 126 exactly by excluding records with these Service Type Codes from the SBC wholesale and retail numerator results.</p> <p>As confirmed with the closing of NR126 as “Satisfied”, the items identified in NR126 did not represent actual issues with SBC Midwest’s performance measurement calculations. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

⁹ A status of “Closed Satisfied” describes a situation where SBC Midwest’s response to an observation or exception successfully resolved any issue that BearingPoint had with respect to the circumstances that generated the finding.

PMR5-2 Analysis**“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)****REVISED**

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 58 O613v4 No Impact	IL, IN, OH, WI	Retest	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s February 2003 restated wholesale results for the July 2002 data month for Performance Measurement 58 (“Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % AIT Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE – 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW) (REF #239) – IL, OH, WI - % AIT Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE – BRI Loop with Test Access (REF #241) – IL, IN, WI - % AIT Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE – DS1 Loop with Test Access (REF #246) – IL, IN <p>The updated Business technical requirements for performance measure 58 (provided to BearingPoint on 6/4/2002), and CR 040902 v2.1 describe the criterion for excluding a loop that is part of the FMOD process. The requirement was changed to the following: include in numerator and denominator only if (FMOD Indicator != 1 OR FMOD Indicator IS Null) OR (FMOD Indicator =1 AND Type of Form = “2D”). This change was implemented in the February 2003 restatement of July 2002 results that BearingPoint is attempting to replicate in Observation 613v4. It appears BearingPoint did not implement this change.</p> <p>For BRI and DS1 Loops, BearingPoint is not including records with (FMOD Indicator =1 AND Type of Form = “2D”), resulting in BearingPoint having fewer records than SBC for these products.</p> <p>For 8 dB Loops and DSL Loops, it appears that BearingPoint implemented the criterion-- FMOD Indicator =1-- but did not implement criterion-- AND Type of Form = “2D”, which resulted in BearingPoint having more records than SBC Midwest for these products.</p> <p>These explanations account for all the differences between BearingPoint’s and SBC’s results cited in Observation 613v4. In fact, SBC Midwest was able to replicate BearingPoint’s results exactly by not applying the new criterion.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued an additional information request on June 26, which SBC Midwest responded to on July 2.</p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued an additional question request on July 7, 2003 which SBC Midwest responded to on July 14, 2003.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued an additional question request on August 8, 2003 which SBC Midwest responded to on August 13, 2003.</u></p> <p>SBC Midwest believes the issue related to O613 is solely caused by an improper exclusion by BearingPoint. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Maintenance & Repair Metrics			
PM 37 <u>Q 627v3</u> <u>O627v4</u> No Impact	IL, IN, OH, WI	<u>Retest</u>	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 37 (“Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trouble Report Rate – POTS – Bus (REF #254) – IL, OH - Trouble Report Rate – POTS – Res (REF #255) – IL, IN, OH, WI - Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Bus (REF #256) – IL, IN, OH, WI - Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Res (REF #257) – IL, IN, OH, WI <p>SBC Midwest has reviewed observation #627v3 and, in a detailed response dated May 13, 2003 identified errors that both SBC Midwest made in its calculation and BearingPoint made in attempting to replicate this measure.</p> <p>The BearingPoint replication errors appear to be the result of incorrect application of the technical documentation. BearingPoint’s replication results a) contain records that should be excluded b) records incorrectly categorized based on the transposition error in the source file c) records that do not have the correct division logic applied and d) contain records that have not been correctly reassigned to the ADTS product category.</p> <p>The SBC Midwest calculation of PM37 was also in error, reflecting the use of incorrect reference tables. SBC Midwest used two tables that contained incorrect records, which caused the results to a) not include certain retail records in the results and b) duplicate records that fell within one geographic disaggregation. This issue has been addressed with February 2003 data going forward.</p> <p>Based on SBC Midwest’s analysis this issue does not meet the SBC Midwest materiality criteria for restatements.¹⁰ Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest’s guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July - September 2002 data months on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint’s test requirements.</p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued Observation 627v4 further narrowing their investigation on August 8, 2003. SBC Midwest responded on August 14, 2003 with further instruction to relating to new BearingPoint calculation errors.</u></p> <p>SBC Midwest corrected the calculation errors identified in observation 627v3 effective with February 2003 results. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

¹⁰ SBC Midwest’s restatement guidelines are published on the SBC CLEC website at <https://pm.sbc.com/pm.cfm> as an addendum to SBC Midwest’s Performance Measurements Internal Change Management Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines. Under these guidelines, restatement of previously published performance results generally depends upon the materiality of the potential restatement. An assessment of materiality is based on whether the recalculated data would result (a) in a shift in the performance in the aggregate from a “make” to a “miss” condition or (b) in a further degradation of reported performance of more than 5% for measures that are in a “miss” condition, provided there are at least 100 CLEC transactions in the sub-metric.

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 37.1 <u>Q 639v3</u> <u>Q 639v4</u> No Impact	IL, IN, OH, WI	Retest	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports – POTS – Bus (REF #258) – IL, OH</u> - <u>Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports – POTS – Res (REF #259) – IL, IN, OH, WI</u> - <u>Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports – UNE-P – Bus (REF#260) – IL, IN, OH, WI</u> - <u>Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports – UNE-P – Res (REF #261) – IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <p>SBC Midwest has reviewed observation #639v3 and, in a detailed response dated May 13, 2003, identified errors that both SBC Midwest made in its calculation and BearingPoint made in attempting to replicate this measure. The BearingPoint replication errors appear to be the result of incorrect application of the technical documentation. BearingPoint’s replication results a) contain records that should be excluded b) records incorrectly categorized based on the transposition error in the source file c) records that do not have the correct division logic applied and d) contain records that have not been correctly reassigned to the ADTS product category.</p> <p>The SBC Midwest calculation was also in error reflecting the use of incorrect reference tables. SBC Midwest used two tables that contained incorrect records, which caused the results to: a) not include certain retail records in the results and b) duplicate records that fell within one geographic disaggregation. This issue has been addressed with February 2003 data going forward.</p> <p>Based on SBC Midwest’s analysis, this issue does not meet the SBC Midwest materiality criteria for restatements.¹¹ Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest’s guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July - September 2002 data months on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint’s test requirements.</p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued Observation 639v4 further narrowing their investigation to one disaggregation in Indiana (Ref#259) on August 1, 2003. SBC Midwest responded on August 13, 2003 with further instruction to relating to new BearingPoint calculation errors.</u></p> <p>SBC Midwest corrected the calculation errors identified in observation 639v3 effective with February 2003 results. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the –March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

¹¹ See note 7.

PMR5-2 Analysis**“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)****REVISED**

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 39 O 858 No Impact	WI	Retest Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 39 (“Receipt to Clear Duration”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Bus – Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #270) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Bus – Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #271) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Bus – No Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #272) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Bus – No Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #273) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Res – Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #274) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Res – Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #275) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Res – No Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #276) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – POTS – Res – No Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #277) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Bus – Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #278) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Bus – Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #279) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Bus – No Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #280) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Bus – No Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #281) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Res – Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #282) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Res – Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #283) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Res – No Dispatch – Affecting Service (hours) (REF #284) – WI - Receipt to Clear Duration – UNE-P – Res – No Dispatch – Out of Service (hours) (REF #285) – WI <p>BearingPoint’s wholesale and retail calculations do not include records with Service Type Code equal to “04”, “05”, “06”, and “07”. These records are classified as either Residence (“04”) or Business (“05”, “06”, or “07”) in the Class of Service Name field referenced in the Business and Technical Requirements for this measure. SBC is able to exactly reproduce BearingPoint’s wholesale and retail results in Observation 858 (with the below listed exceptions) by excluding records with these Service Type Code codes from the SBC results.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BearingPoint’s WI- All retail results do not include records from metro area= “UNDETERMINED.” This affects two retail results in Observation 858: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POTS-Bus-Dispatch-Out Of Service - SBC includes one more record with a numerator value of 5.90 hours • POTS-Res-Dispatch-Affecting Service - SBC includes three more records with a combined numerator value of 35.45 hours (Note that if records with Service Type Code = “04”, “05”, “06”, or “07” are correctly counted in the results, there are 11 records in WI- Undetermined across all disaggregations in WI.); 2. BearingPoint excludes one retail record from Milwaukee Metro, POTS- Bus- No Dispatch- Affecting Service that SBC includes. SBC is unable to determine why BearingPoint excludes this record. <p>These explanations account for all the differences between BearingPoint and SBC results cited in Observation 858. As they are a result of improper exclusions by BearingPoint in the replication process, this issue has no impact on the –March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. <u>As confirmed with the closing of Observation 858 as “Satisfied”, the items identified in O858 did not represent actual issues with</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)**REVISED**

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
			<u>SBC Midwest’s performance measurement calculations.</u>
PM 40 NR121 No Impact	WI	Closed, Satisfied ¹²	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 40 (“Percent Out of Service (OSS)<24 Hours”).</i></p> <p>- Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours – UNE-P Res (REF #289) – WI</p> <p>BearingPoint’s wholesale calculations do not include records with Class of Service equal to “04”. These records should be included in the Residence disaggregations. SBC Midwest is able to reproduce BearingPoint’s results in NR 121 by excluding records with these Class of Service codes from the SBC results. This explanation accounts for the differences between BearingPoint’s and SBC Midwest’s Wisconsin results.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued the remaining portion of this NR, which affects only one disaggregation in Michigan, as Observation 865 on June 27th.</p> <p>As evidenced by the removal of all WI disaggregations with the release of O865, this issue is resolved for Wisconsin and therefore has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

¹² NR 121 initially affected both Wisconsin and Michigan. The Wisconsin issues have now been resolved and Observation 865, which is Michigan specific has been opened. Therefore this finding is shown here as “Closed, Satisfied”.

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 41 O862 No Impact	WI	Retest Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % Repeat Reports – POTS – Bus (REF #290) – WI - % Repeat Reports – POTS – Res (REF #291) – WI - % Repeat Reports – UNE-P – Bus (REF #292) – WI - % Repeat Reports – UNE-P – Bus (REF #293) – WI <p>BearingPoint’s wholesale and retail calculations do not include records with Service Type Code equal to “04”, “05”, “06”, and “07”. These records are classified as either Residence (“04”) or Business (“05”, “06”, or “07”) in the Class of Service Name field referenced in the Business and Technical Requirements for this measure.13. In addition, BearingPoint’s WI- All retail results do not include records from metro area= “Undetermined.” This explanation accounts for the differences between BearingPoint’s and SBC Midwest’s Wisconsin results.</p> <p>SBC Midwest believes the issue related to O862 is caused by improper exclusions by BearingPoint. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. <u>As confirmed with the closing of Observation 862 as “Satisfied”, the items identified in O862 did not represent actual issues with SBC Midwest’s performance measurement calculations.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
<u>PM 54.1</u> <u>O664</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL</u>	<u>Closed</u> <u>Satisfied</u>	<p><u><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports").</i></u></p> <p><u><i>- Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts – UNE Loop & Port – ISDN PRI (REF #301) – IL</i></u></p> <p><u>Observation 664 was resolved by virtue of addressing errors in the BearingPoint calculation as well as the usage of an incorrect reference table by SBC Midwest. The correction of BearingPoint replication errors addressed the preponderance of issues affecting the replication of results.</u></p> <p><u>The SBC Midwest calculation reflected the use of an incorrect reference table. SBC Midwest used a table that had incorrect records in it which caused the results to duplicate records that fell within one geography disaggregation. SBC Midwest determined that the use of this table did not cause the results to be outside the materiality threshold. This issue was fixed beginning with February 2003 data going forward and had no material impact on previous results.</u></p> <p><u>This issue has been addressed going forward with February 2003 results. Although not a material impact to the results, SBC Midwest elected to restate the results for PM 54.1 for July, August, and September 2002 in order to satisfy the BearingPoint test.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint closed this observation as "Satisfied" on August 12, 2003, as it was successful in its replication effort. However, the disaggregation listed as 'NM' (Non-Match) on the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix is due to the restatement of PM 54.1 where the result posted by SBC Midwest was different than the BearingPoint calculated result. This represents a "failure by rule" within BearingPoint's testing methodology.</u></p> <p><u>The issue identified in this Observation did not materially affect results for July-September 2002 and were addressed with February 2003 results going forward, therefore not impacting the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 67 NR120 No Impact	IL, OH	Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 67 (“Mean Time to Restore”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours) – Dispatch (REF #306) – IL, OH - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours) – No Dispatch (REF #307) – IL, OH - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – BRI Loop with Test Access (hours) – No Dispatch (REF #311) – IL - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – Broadband DSL – Line Sharing (hours) – No Dispatch (REF #313) – OH <p><u>8.0 dB Loops</u> The retail equivalent for 8.0 dB Loops combines Business and Residence records from POTS and uses Field Visit Enhanced Indicator to disaggregate records into “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch”. Additionally, SBC Midwest confirmed BearingPoint’s 8.0 dB Loop data file, contains 297 records, all records are POTS ISDN records (Class of Service= “20” or “26”) with Field Visit Enhanced Indicator values equal to 1. BearingPoint uses Dispatch Out Indicator to separate “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch” disaggregations to produce its Retail Values. However, during July 2002, the Field Enhanced Indicator method was used (effective with April 2002 results, reported on May 20, 2002).</p> <p><u>BRI Loops</u> The retail equivalent for BRI combines records from POTS and Specials. SBC Midwest uses Field Visit Enhanced Indicator to disaggregate POTS records into “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch”. BearingPoint appears to be using only the Dispatch Out Indicator to disaggregate the POTS data. By combining BearingPoint’s POTS and Specials ISDN BRI records and using the Field Visit Enhanced Indicator in the POTS data, SBC Midwest reproduces the SBC Retail Values for “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch” for all the metro areas.</p> <p><u>Broadband DSL - Line Sharing</u> BearingPoint’s Retail Values include only records with ACNA= “AAV”, while SBC Midwest includes records with blank ACNA fields as documented in the Business Technical requirements. The measure criteria explain that “Reported ACNA Code of Null/Blank should be reported as the Affiliate (as if Reported ACNA Code is ‘AAV’), since all Broadband Line Share and most DSL Line Share is for the Affiliate.”</p> <p>After reviewing SBC Midwest’s response to NR120, BearingPoint closed NR 120 as satisfied.</p> <p>As confirmed with the closing of NR120 as “Satisfied”, the items identified in NR120 did not represent actual issues with SBC Midwest’s performance measurement calculations. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
PM 67 O861 No Impact	IN	Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 67 (“Mean Time to Restore”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – BRI Loop with Test Access (hours) – No Dispatch (REF #311) – IN - Mean Time to Restore – UNE – Broadband DSL – Line Sharing (hours) – No Dispatch (REF #313) – IN <p><u>BRI Loops</u> The retail equivalent for BRI combines records from POTS and Specials. SBC Midwest uses Field Visit Enhanced Indicator to disaggregate POTS records into “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch”. BearingPoint appears to be using only the Dispatch Out Indicator to disaggregate the POTS data. By combining BearingPoint’s POTS and Specials ISDN BRI records and using the Field Visit Enhanced Indicator in the POTS data, SBC Midwest reproduces the Retail Values for “Dispatch” and “No Dispatch” for all the metro areas.</p> <p><u>Broadband DSL - Line Sharing</u> BearingPoint’s Retail Values include only records with ACNA= “AAV”, while SBC Midwest includes records with blank ACNA fields as documented in the Business Technical requirements. The measure criteria explain that “Reported ACNA Code of Null/Blank should be reported as the Affiliate (as if Reported ACNA Code is ‘AAV’), since all Broadband Line Share and most DSL Line Share is for the Affiliate.”</p> <p>BearingPoint proposed to close this observation as “Satisfied” on July 1.</p> <p>As evidenced by the successful closing of O861, the items included in O861 did not represent actual issues with SBC Midwest’s performance metrics processing. Therefore, this observation has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>
Interconnection Trunks Metrics			
PM 78 O824 No Impact	WI	Retest Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval = Interconnection Trunks (days) (REF #349) - WI <p>The September 2002 CLEC numerator and denominator differences for Wisconsin are the result of SBC Midwest using an incorrect version of the Specials Installation data files in the calculation of this measure for September 2002. Although not material based on SBC Midwest’s guidelines, SBC Midwest restated the September data month for this measure on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint test requirements.</p> <p>This issue was a one-time manual error for September 2002. Therefore, it has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
<u>LNP Metrics</u>			
<u>PM 96</u> <u>O 710</u> <u>(Not a</u> <u>PMR5-2</u> <u>Finding)</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IN, OH,</u> <u>WI</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>BearingPoint is attempting to replicate SBC Midwest's published performance measurement reports for the months of July, August and September 2002 for Performance Measurements 96, 97 and 98. The technical documentation for these measures indicate that when performing the calculation for the respective measure, the following exclusion should be applied to the data: "DD Misfunction Code (1,1) NOT IN ('C','D','A')." This criterion excludes "CLEC Caused Misses" from the data set. However, "CLEC caused misses" is not an allowed exclusion in the published Metrics Business Rules for these measures.</u></p> <p><u>- % Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders – LNP Only (REF #354) – IN, OH, WI</u> <u>- % Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders – LNP With Loop (REF #355) – WI</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest restated the results for PM 96 for July, August, and September 2002 to satisfy the BearingPoint testing of Observation 710. However, the disaggregations are listed as 'NM' (Non-Match) on the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix because the restatement of PM 96 caused the result posted by SBC Midwest to be different than the BearingPoint calculated result. This represents a 'failure by rule' only as all restatements are treated in this manner in BearingPoint's testing methodology. This status, with respect to Observation 710 does not indicate that the posted results are incorrect.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest understands that BearingPoint has now successfully replicated these disaggregations, and therefore these issues do not impact the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Coordinated Conversions Metrics			
PM 114 PM 114.1 PM 115 PM 115.1 O 793 No Impact	OH, IL, WI	Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest's August 2002 reported results for PM 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), PM 114.1 ("CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval"), PM 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers"), and PM 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports").</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PM 114: % Premature Disconnects – FDT (REF #358) – OH, WI; (REF #359) – IL - PM 114.1: Provisioning Interval FDT-LNP with Loop < 10 lines (REF #361) – OH, WI; (REF #362) – IL - PM 114.1: Provisioning Interval FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines (REF #362) – OH, WI; (REF #363) – IL - PM 115: % of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop > 30 Min (REF #366) – OH, WI; (REF #367) – IL - PM 115: % of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop > 60 Min (REF #367) – OH, WI; (REF #368) – IL - PM 115: % of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop > 120 Min (REF #368) – OH, WI; (REF #369) – IL - PM 115.1: % of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover – FDT (REF #370) – OH, WI; (REF #371) – IL <p>SBC Midwest restated the results for six submetrics across four PMs (114, 114.1, 115 and 115.1) for August 2002 as a result of a manual data collection error made during the posting process. This manual error was made only for the August 2002 reported results and did not require a computer programming code update or change. SBC Midwest addressed this issue via the reinforcement of measurement process training within the applicable service delivery organization.</p> <p>BearingPoint closed this observation as “Satisfied” on April 22, 2003. However, this disaggregation is listed as ‘NM’ (Non-Match) on the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix because of the restatement of August 2002 results. BearingPoint successfully replicated July and September 2002 results for these submetrics.</p> <p>This issue was a one-time manual error for August 2002. Therefore, it has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, and Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
Other Metrics			
<u>PM MI 14</u> <u>O 642v2</u> <u>(Not a</u> <u>PMR5-2</u> <u>Finding)</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN,</u> <u>OH, WI</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 14 ("Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within X Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket") do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules. SBC Midwest is counting duplicate notifications in the manual UNE-P and manual Resale disaggregations.</u></p> <p><u>- % Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – Resale Manual – Next Day (REF #380) – IN, OH, WI; (REF #381) – IL</u></p> <p><u>- % Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P Manual – Next Day (REF #384) – IN, OH, WI; (REF #385) – IL</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest implemented modifications to address this issue coincident with ER 1477-1002 for October 2002 results going forward and subsequently restated the results for PM MI 14 for July, August, and September 2002 on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy the BearingPoint test.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint reported that they are working through the restatement data relating to this observation. Testing activities are scheduled for completion for this PM by September 30 2003.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest implemented modifications to address this issue for October 2002 data going forward. As such, this issue does not impact the results posted results for the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-2 Analysis

“NM” Issues From BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachments D_{v2}-IL, D_{v2}-IN, D_{v2}-OH, and D_{v2}-WI)**REVISED**

PM Issue # ¹ Impact ²	States ³	Current Status ⁴	BearingPoint Issue Description and SBC Midwest Comments ⁵
<u>PM MI 14</u> <u>O876</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>OH, WI</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u><i>BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Midwest’s July, August and September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI 14(“PM MI 14 Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket”).</i></u></p> <p><u><i>- % Completion Notifications Returned Within “X” Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – Resale Electronic < 1 hour (REF #381) – OH, WI</i></u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest reviewed Observation 876 and determined several reasons for the discrepancies in the data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>For July, August, and September 2002 data, Bearing Point was using version 1.0 of the BTR whereas the current version effective with the October 2002 restatement is version 1.2.</u> <u>SBC Midwest’s data file which was used for the July posted results contained missing data for some days and duplicate data for other days.</u> <p><u>SBC Midwest has restated this measure on July 7, 2003 coincident with O-642 using corrected July 2002 data (ER #840-0603 PIP 271). BearingPoint is currently using the correct version of July 2002 data.</u></p> <p><u>Because this issue was related to a documentation change and otherwise limited to the one-time use of an incorrect file for July results posted by SBC Midwest, the issue does not impact the results posted results for the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

ATTACHMENT Fv2

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachments Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

DRAFT

Index of PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachment Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM# ¹	Measure Description ²	PMR-5.3/5.4 Exc/Obs ³	State Applicability ⁴	E&Y Issue ⁵	Corrective Action Date ⁶	March - May '03 Impact ⁷
1.2	Accuracy of LMU for DSL (Manual)	O697 <u>O856</u>	IL, IN, OH, WI <u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	N/A <u>N/A</u>	Jan '03 <u>Jul '03⁸</u>	No Impact ⁹ <u>No Material Impact</u>
5	% FOCs w/in "X" Hrs	O787	IL, IN, OH, WI	Work Papers	Jul '02	No Impact
7	% Mech CNs w/in 1 Hr of Completion	O429 O659 O787 O854	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.8 Att B.4 Work Papers N/A	Jun '02 N/A Jul '02 N/A	No Impact Interpretation ¹⁰ , No Impact No Impact No Impact
9	% Rejects	O688 O727	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Work Papers Att B.4	Jan '03 N/A	No Impact Interpretation, No Impact
10	% Mech Rejects w/in 1 Hr of Reject in MOR	O756 O803 O809 O823	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.4 N/A N/A I.17	N/A Sep '02 Aug '02 Apr '02	Interpretation, No Impact No Impact No Impact No Impact
10.1	% Mech Rejects w/in 1 Hr of Order	O727 O755	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.4 Work Papers	N/A Jul '02	Interpretation, No Impact No Impact
10.2	% Man Rejects Rcv'd Electronically w/in 5 Hrs	O727 O755	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.4 Work Papers	N/A Jul '02	Interpretation, No Impact No Impact
10.3	% Man Rejects Rcv'd Manually w/in 5 Hrs	O727 O755	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.4 Work Papers	N/A Jul '02	Interpretation, No Impact No Impact

¹ This column contains the PM#s for the key (48) PMs that are analyzed in this chart.

² This column provides a brief description of the key (48) PMs.

³ This column lists the specific BearingPoint Observation or Exception (O/E) number(s).

⁴ The SBC Midwest states for which the O/E is applicable.

⁵ This column provides the specific link to the E&Y reports E&Y's Final "Report of Independent Accountants" and the BOC applicants' "Report of Management on Changes Implemented to the Reporting of Performance Measurements (Final Corrective Action Report)" including "Attachment A-Exceptions to Compliance," for each state are dated April 16, 2003. Illinois Bell filed its Reports with the ICC on June 4, 2003 in Docket No. 01-0662; Indiana Bell filed its Reports with the IURC on May 12, 2003 in Cause No. 41657; Ohio Bell filed its Reports with the PUCO on June 18, 2003 in Case No. 00-942-TP-COI; and Wisconsin Bell filed its Reports with the PSCW on April 28, 2003 in Docket No. 6720-TI-170. The work paper items are referenced to SBC's March 28, 2003 Ex Parte. See Ex Parte Letter of Geoffrey M. Klineberg on behalf of SBC to Marlene Dortch, FCC (March 28, 2003) at Attachment A, Exhibit 2 (PMR4) and Exhibit 3 (PMR5); see also, Report of Independent Accountants Dated March 31, 2003 (regarding these Michigan Bell's management assertions), Ex Parte Letter of Geoffrey M. Klineberg on behalf of SBC to Marlene Dortch, FCC (April 1, 2003). Footnote references will be made to those instances where the specific number reference is not identical between the individual state reports.

⁶ The 'Corrective Action Date' represents the first month for which a modification or restatement is effective; each O/E has no impact to posted results after the corrective action date

⁷ SBC Midwest's classification of the impact that the O/E has on results filed with the FCC for the months of March through May 2003

⁸ Updated documentation reflecting programming for July-September 2002 was delivered on July 17, 2003.

⁹ "No Impact" indicates that the issue has no effect on the posted performance results for the data months of March, April, or May 2003, filed with the FCC.

¹⁰ "Interpretation" indicates that BearingPoint is applying an interpretation different from the interpretation SBC Midwest used in its implementation of the PM.

Index of PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachment Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM# ¹	Measure Description ²	PMR-5.3/5.4 Exc/Obs ³	State Applicability ⁴	E&Y Issue ⁵	Corrective Action Date ⁶	March - May '03 Impact ⁷
10.4	% Jeopardy Notices	O676 O687 O725 O756	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.12 N/A II.13 Att B.4	Jun '02 Jul '02 Jun '02 N/A	No Impact No Impact No Impact Interpretation, No Impact
11	MTTRet Mech Rejects	O584 O643 O756 O803 O809 O823	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.4 N/A Att B.4 N/A N/A N/A	N/A Sep '02 N/A Sep '02 Aug '02 Apr '02	Interpretation & No Material Impact ¹¹ No Impact Interpretation, No Impact No Impact No Impact No Impact
11.1	MTTRet Man Rejects Rcv'd Electronically	O643 O727 O755	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A Att B.4 Work Papers	Sep '02 N/A Jul '02	No Impact Interpretation, No Impact No Impact
11.2	MTTRet Man Rejects Rcv'd Manually	O643 O727 O755	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A Att B.4 Work Papers	Sep '02 N/A Jul '02	No Impact Interpretation, No Impact No Impact
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	O794	WI	Work Papers	Aug '02	No Impact
13	Order Process % Flow Through	O488 O746 O866	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.18 Work Papers N/A	Nov '02 N/A Sep '02	No Impact Interpretation No Material Impact No Impact
14	Billing Accuracy					
17	Billing Completeness	O731	IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.11	N/A	Interpretation No Impact

¹¹ "No Material Impact" indicates that although there is an outstanding issue during the March, April, or May 2003 timeframe, it does not result in material differences in the aggregate performance results for the data filed with the FCC. For purpose of this analysis SBC Midwest is using the materiality standard in its PM restatement guidelines when assessing the impact of an issue or of corrective action. SBC Midwest's restatement guidelines are published on the SBC CLEC website at <https://pm.sbc.com/pm.cfm> as an addendum to SBC Midwest's Performance Measurements Internal Change Management Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines. Under these guidelines, restatement of previously published performance results generally depends upon the materiality of the potential restatement. An assessment of materiality is based on whether the recalculated data would result (a) in a shift in the performance in the aggregate from a "make" to a "miss" condition or (b) in a further degradation of reported performance of more than 5% for measures that are in a "miss" condition, provided there are at least 100 CLEC transactions in the sub-metric.

Index of PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachment Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM# ¹	Measure Description ²	PMR-5.3/5.4 Exc/Obs ³	State Applicability ⁴	E&Y Issue ⁵	Corrective Action Date ⁶	March - May '03 Impact ⁷
18	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)	O845	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	N/A	Interpretation Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard ¹²
		<u>O864</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>			
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	O694	IL, IN, OH, WI	Work Papers	N/A	Interpretation Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard
		O846	IL, IN, OH, WI	Work Papers	Dec. '02	No Impact
27	Mean Install Interval	<u>O883</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard</u>
28	% Installs w/in Customer Requested DD	O739	IL, IN, OH, WI	Att B.16	Jan '03	Interpretation, No Impact
29	% AIT-Caused Missed DDs	O628	IL, IN, WI	Att B.17	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
35	% Troubles w/in 30 Days of Install					
37	Trouble Report Rate					
37.1	Trouble Rate Net of Installs & Repeats					
38	% Missed Repair Commitments					
39	Receipt to Clear Duration					
40	% Out Of Service (OOS) <24 Hrs	<u>O884</u>	<u>WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Aug '03</u>	<u>No Material Impact</u>
41	% Repeat Reports					
45	% AIT Caused Missed DDs – Design	O711	IL, IN, WI	Att B.17	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
54.1	Trouble Rate Net of Installs & Repeats					
56	% Installs w/in Customer Requested DD	O729	IL, IN, OH, WI	V.7 ¹³	Jan '03	No Impact
56.1	% (UNE) Installs w/in Customer Requested DD	O729	IL, IN, OH, WI	V.7 ¹⁴	Jan '03	No Impact
58	% AIT Caused Missed DDs – UNE	O711	IL, IN, WI	Att B.17	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
67	Mean Time to Restore	E111	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Feb '03	Interpretation No Impact
73	% Missed DDs – Interconnection Trunks					
78	Avg Interconnection Trunk Install Interval	O719	IL, IN, WI	Att B.26 ¹⁵	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact

¹² “Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard” indicates that SBC Midwest’s implementation does not comport to the literal reading of the business rules, but does produce a stricter, narrower standard than would be achieved by following the business rule as written.

¹³ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section III #3.

¹⁴ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section III #3.

¹⁵ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #28.

Index of PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachment Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM# ¹	Measure Description ²	PMR-5.3/5.4 Exc/Obs ³	State Applicability ⁴	E&Y Issue ⁵	Corrective Action Date ⁶	March - May '03 Impact ⁷
91	% of LNP Only DDs w/in Industry Guidelines	O732	IL, IN, OH, WI	II.23	Jun '02	No Impact
		O756	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
		O834	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Feb '03	No Impact
		O835	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Feb '03	No Impact
96	% Premature Disconnects – LNP	O710	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Jul '02 ¹⁶	No Impact
110	% Updates Completed in DA Database w/in 72 Hrs	O689	IL, OH, WI	Work Papers	Nov '02	Interpretation, Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard
114	% Premature Disconnects – Coordinated Cuts	O570	IL, IN, OH, WI	II.48 ¹⁷	Sep '02	No Impact
		O631	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Feb '03	Interpretation, No Impact
		O722	IL, IN, WI	Att B.33 ¹⁸	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
		O815	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Jul '02	No Impact
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval	<u>O880</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>
115	% of AIT-Caused Delayed Coordinated Cuts	O570	IL, IN, OH, WI	II.48 ¹⁹	Sep '02	No Impact
		O631	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Apr '03	Interpretation, No Impact
		O677	IL, IN, OH, WI	Work Papers ²⁰	Jul '02	No Impact
		O722	IL, IN, WI	Att B.33 ²¹	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
115.1	% of AIT Caused Delayed Coordinated Cuts-FDT	<u>O880</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>
		O722	IL, IN, WI	Att B.33 ²²	N/A	Interpretation, No Impact
		O738	IL, IN, OH, WI	N/A	Feb '03	No Impact
		<u>O872</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>
		<u>O873</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>
		<u>O880</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>

¹⁶ Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest's guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July, August, and September 2002 data months on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint's test requirements. The corrective action was implemented on a going forward basis for the November 2002 data month, and therefore one month (October, 2002) was not corrected.

¹⁷ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #47.

¹⁸ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #35. The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Indiana E&Y Interpretation report as #34.

¹⁹ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #47.

²⁰ The E&Y work paper reference applies to both Ohio and Illinois. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section III #9.

²¹ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #35. The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Indiana E&Y Interpretation report as #34.

²² The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #35. The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Indiana E&Y Interpretation report as #34.

Index of PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrices (Attachment Dv2-IL, Dv2-IN, Dv2-OH, Dv2-WI)

REVISED

PM# ¹	Measure Description ²	PMR-5.3/5.4 Exc/Obs ³	State Applicability ⁴	E&Y Issue ⁵	Corrective Action Date ⁶	March - May '03 Impact ⁷
MI 3	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval	O631 O722 <u>O877</u> <u>O878</u> <u>O879</u> <u>O880</u>	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, WI <u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u>	N/A Att B.33 ²³ <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u>	May '03 N/A <u>April '03</u> <u>Oct. '02</u> <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u>	Interpretation, No Impact Interpretation, No Impact <u>No Material Impact</u> <u>No Impact</u> <u>No Impact</u> <u>Interpretation, No Impact</u>
MI 9	% Missing FOCs	O661 O787 O792	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.26 Work Papers N/A	Jun '02 Jul '02 Jul '02	No Impact No Impact No Impact
MI 11	Avg Interface Outage Notification	O594 O624	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.52 ²⁴ 1.51	Jan '03 Jan '03	No Impact No Impact
MI 13	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hr of SO Completion	O661 O787	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.30 ²⁵ Work Papers	Jun '02 Jul '02	No Impact No Impact
MI 14	% CNs w/in "X" Hrs of TT Completion	O637 O642 O847 O848	IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI IL, IN, OH, WI	II.40 Work Papers N/A V.12 ²⁶	Jun '02 Jul '02 N/A Feb '03	No Impact No Impact Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard No Impact

²³ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #35. The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Indiana Interpretation report as #34.

²⁴ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #51.

²⁵ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #29.

²⁶ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section V #8.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 429v4 No Impact³²	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B)	7	Retest ³³	<p><i>Through its blind replication process, BearingPoint identified that SBC Midwest was missing start times on some of its orders in July, August, and September 2002 data, for Performance Measures 7 (“Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems”) and 8 (“Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions”) for these months as well.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this blank “Start Times” data field issue by implementing a computer programming code change as referenced in ER 929-0502 and ER 1179-0802, effective with October 2002 data reported November 20, 2002. SBC Midwest restated the PM 7 results for June, July, August, and September 2002 on January 6, 2003 and on February 5, 2003.</p> <p>Since corrective action was implemented in June 2002 forward, this issue did not impact the March, April, and May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #8 and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

²⁷ This column identifies the BearingPoint Observation or Exception (O/E) number and SBC Midwest’s classification of the impact that the O/E has on results filed with the FCC for the months of –March - May 2003.

²⁸ This column identifies the SBC Midwest states for which the O/E is applicable and the specific test points associated with those SBC Midwest states. .

²⁹ This column identifies the PM(s) impacted by the BearingPoint O/E.

³⁰ This column represents the current status of the BearingPoint O/E as of August 15, 2003 unless otherwise noted.

³¹ This section includes a brief description of the issue identified by BearingPoint in the O/E; a summary of the SBC Midwest investigation and corrective actions to address the O/E; and SBC Midwest’s comments regarding the impact the O/E has on the posted results for the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.

³² An assessment of “No Impact” indicates that the issue has no effect on the posted results for the data months of March –May 2003 filed with the FCC.

³³ A Status of “Retest” indicates that SBC Midwest has responded to the BearingPoint issues and is awaiting their review of the response and the retesting of the finding.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O-488v3 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B)	13	Closed, Not Satisfied ³⁴	<p><i>SBC Midwest's calculations of Performance Measurement 13 ("Order Process Percent Flow Through") and Performance Measurement 13.1 ("Total Order Process Percent Flow Through") do not follow the published metrics business rule for July, August, and September 2003. BearingPoint learned that SBC Midwest does exclude revisions to orders from the calculation of the PMs.</i></p> <p>According to the published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 13 and 13.1, revisions to orders should not be excluded from the calculation of the UNE disaggregation. BearingPoint learned that SBC Midwest was excluding revisions to orders from the calculation of the UNE disaggregation. Version 2 of this finding, issued on June 17, 2002, eliminated the reference to the UNE disaggregation, and modified its finding to state that SBC Midwest does exclude revisions to orders from the calculation of the PM 13 and 13.1 results. Version 3 of the finding updated it to focus on the July, August, and September 2002 results.</p> <p>SBC Midwest responded by acknowledging that revisions that automatically flow through the order systems for due date changes and cancellations were not being reported under Performance Measures 13 and 13.1. Until the August 2002 OSS Release, revisions for only Resale and UNE-P for due date changes and cancellations were designed to flow through as long as the Original Request was flow through eligible. Since then changes have been made that provided the capability of reporting supplemental order flow through for those products that are flow through eligible. Order revisions for due date and cancellations for UNE Loops, Line Sharing and LNP were made on August 28, 2002, effective with October 2002 results. September results were restated in December 2002. LSNP revisions for due date changes and cancellations were made flow through eligible with the November OSS Release and reflected in results effective with November 2002 performance data.</p> <p>These computer code modifications made by SBC Midwest now provide SBC Midwest with the capability of reporting supplemental flow through in accordance with the business rules. Restatements for July and August 2002, when this functionality was implemented, cannot be made because the data needed for these PMs was not captured during that time period. Therefore, BearingPoint closed the issue as "Not Satisfied" because the issue could not be completely corrected and implemented during their evaluation period (the three consecutive months of July, August, and September 2002). Nevertheless, this issue has been corrected on a prospective basis. LSNP revisions for due date changes and cancellations were first made flow through eligible in November and were reflected in the performance measure in the November data. All other necessary corrective actions were completed effective with October 2002 results. As a result of these modifications, this issue was resolved effective with November 2002 results and there is no adverse impact on the March, April, and May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #18 (Line Share) and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

³⁴ A status of "Closed, Not Satisfied" means that BearingPoint reviewed SBC Midwest's response and/or implementation of modifications and SBC Midwest's actions did not produce results for the test months of July-September 2002 that met the test standards. This is the case when the implemented corrective action is prospective only.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 570v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-N)	114, 115	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") and 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") do not follow the July, August and September 2002 published metrics business rules. The technical documentation for Performance Measurements 114 and 115 indicates that when performing the calculation for this disaggregation, SBC Midwest always assumes that the actual cutover time for Frame Due Time orders is equal to the time that the cutover was scheduled regardless of whether or not this was actually the case. This causes the numerator for the Frame Due Time – LNP with Loop disaggregation to always equal zero, and as a result, skews the reported result for these measures.</i></p> <p>For PM 114, SBC Midwest implemented a network process change to better capture the actual start times of coordinated cutovers (FDT) effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002. Prior to this change, the SBC Midwest source systems could not capture the actual start time of coordinated cutovers SBC Midwest implemented a revised method of capturing and reporting this data beginning with the August 2002 results reported in September 2002. SBC Midwest restated the June 2002 and July 2002 results on October 7, 2002.</p> <p>For PM 115, SBC Midwest implemented an additional network process change to more precisely capture the actual start times coordinated cutovers (FDT) effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002. PM 115 results could not be restated for the June 2002 through August 2002 months because the process change could not be applied in arrears.</p> <p>The process changes that SBC Midwest implemented in September 2002 ensure that this issue does not adversely affect reported results going forward, including the three months of data filed with the FCC. BearingPoint closed this observation in a "Not Satisfied" condition because the corrective action could not be implemented in arrears. However, BearingPoint verified that September 2002 results were produced in conformance with the applicable state business rules.</p> <p>The FDT related issues in this Exception were addressed by E&Y in Section II, #48³⁵ and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

³⁵ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #47.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 584v2 Interpretation³⁶ No Material Impact³⁷	IL, IN, OH, WI PMR 4 & PMR 5 (5-4-B)	11	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is using inaccurate data in the calculation of PM 11 (“Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects”). SBC Midwest updates the appropriate order receipt timestamps to reflect the next available business day when an order is received through an EDI / interface during MOR system downtimes as allowed for by the published business rules. SBC Midwest does not revise the corresponding reject response timestamps when responses are sent during MOR system downtimes. This causes a number of response timestamps to have values less than that of their corresponding receipt timestamps, resulting in negative time durations. SBC Midwest sets any negative time durations to zero thus skewing the calculation of Performance Measure 11. BearingPoint determined that this issue does not apply to PM 10, as documented in additional information issued by BearingPoint on October 21, 2002.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest identified the following 4 scenarios that would be affected by the issue raised in v2 of this observation in its calculation of PM 11:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transactions received by SBC Midwest prior to scheduled system downtime. Response sent to CLEC during scheduled system downtime. 2. Transactions received by SBC Midwest during scheduled system downtime. Response sent to CLEC during same scheduled system downtime. 3. Transactions received by SBC Midwest during scheduled system downtime. Response sent to CLEC during scheduled system uptime. 4. Transactions received by SBC Midwest prior to scheduled system downtime. Response sent to CLEC during scheduled system uptime after passing through a downtime period. <p>SBC Midwest calculates the intervals for these four scenarios in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For scenario 1, the duration time is calculated from the time the transaction is received from the CLEC to the time the SBC Midwest system is scheduled to go off-line. 2. For scenario 2, SBC Midwest sets the duration at one minute since the transaction was received during the system downtime. 3. For scenario 3, the duration time included in the PM11 calculation is measured from the time the system is scheduled to come on-line to the time SBC Midwest sends a response to the CLEC. The reason for this is because the response cannot be executed and transmitted to the CLEC until after the system is on-line.

³⁶ The “Interpretation” classification means that BearingPoint applied a different interpretation to the business rule than the one made by SBC Midwest when it implemented the rule.

³⁷ The term “No Material Impact” indicates that any outstanding issues that could affect the March, April, or May 2003 results are not significant enough to make a material difference in the aggregate performance results for the data filed with the FCC. For purpose of this analysis, SBC Midwest is using the materiality standard in its PM restatement guidelines when assessing the impact of an issue or of corrective action. Under these guidelines, restatement of previously published performance results generally depends upon the materiality of the potential restatement. An assessment of materiality is based on whether the recalculated data would result (a) in a shift in the performance in the aggregate from a “make” to a “miss” condition; or (b) in a further degradation of reported performance of more than 5% for measures that are in a “miss” condition, provided there are at least 100 CLEC transactions in the sub-metric.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
				<p>4. For scenario 4, the duration time included in the calculation is measured from the time the transaction is received to the time the system goes off-line plus the time interval measured from the time the system is scheduled to be brought on-line to the time SBC Midwest transmits the response to the CLEC.</p> <p>On January 10, 2003, BearingPoint concluded that SBC Midwest's implementation of the business rule for Scenarios 1, 3, and 4 was appropriate and that it accurately reflected the handling of scheduled system downtime. BearingPoint did not agree that the SBC Midwest handling of scenario 2 was appropriate and further reiterated its position that SBC Midwest should exclude these transactions to more accurately reflect the overall average as calculated in this measure. SBC Midwest determined that BearingPoint was incorrect in its recommendation and that SBC Midwest's implementation of the business rule in this scenario was appropriate. SBC Midwest does not plan to modify its procedures for the following three reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CLECs expect the volumes reported in PM 11 to be the same as the volumes reported in PM 10. A variance caused by excluding transactions (BearingPoint's solution) would cause concern and result in questions by the CLECs. 2. While the exclusion of scheduled system downtime has been added as a clarification to the business rules in the most recent six-month collaborative, the exclusion of responses has not. BearingPoint's recommendation would require an exclusion that is not, or will not, be specified in the new business rules. 3. SBC Midwest has determined that the number of responses that are assigned as 1 minute duration due to the situation identified in scenario 2 was less than .01% of total responses for September 2002. Another sample from March 2003 revealed <u>zero</u> scenario 2 responses for that month. Making the modification specified by BearingPoint would not materially alter reported results but would create new issues. <p>BearingPoint recognized that three of the four scenarios described in this observation are appropriate and has satisfied its concerns. SBC Midwest believes it is appropriately handling the fourth scenario and will propose clarification language in the business rule in the next six-month review that addresses this scenario 2 issue. Given that <1% of responses generally fall into this category, there is no material impact to reported results including the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y considered portions of this issue as a reasonable interpretation as represented in E&Y Attachment B Interpretation #4.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 594 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-R)	MI 11	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 11 ("Average Interface Outage Notification") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules. SBC Midwest's procedure for calculating this measure is incorrect, resulting in the reporting of a decreased notification interval.</i></p> <p>Upon consideration of SBC Midwest's response to this Observation, BearingPoint agreed with SBC Midwest that the outage identification time does not necessarily correspond to the CLEC call time. As a result of this common understanding, the only remaining unresolved issue in this observation was that BearingPoint had observed instances in the Performance Measurement MI 11 data where the page time, representing the outage identification time, carried a time stamp that was later than the notification e-mail time. SBC Midwest reported that there are a number of reasons why the e-mail time might precede the page time. For instance, two people may be working the same problem or if there was a system delay in the actual paging. These situations do not indicate that there is a system problem or that the data is erroneous, rather they indicate that SBC Midwest is notifying CLECs of outages as soon as is possible.</p> <p>In August 2002, the IT Call Center personnel were directed to count 1 minute as the minimum whenever an e-mail preceded a page. However, this process change was not implemented prior to the data restatement for January – July 2002. There are no occurrences of zero or negative durations for any month after August 2002 with the exception of one manual error in October 2002. In this isolated case, the minimum time interval of 1 minute was not assigned to the transaction during the final summarization process. SBC Midwest has made significant changes to this manual data collection process since August 2002. The business requirements (BTR) documents were updated in January 2003 to formalize the enhancements to the process via ER 1396-1202. Starting in January 2003, a senior manager who is responsible for creating the summary log and the ICS Senior Business Manager individually review each item in the log to ensure accuracy. In addition, the final process of data summarization, which was a manual process, has been mechanized. The new mechanized process was run in test mode for January/February 2003 and was put into production for March 2003 business via ER S1485-1102. The technical requirements include converting negative or zero values to a value of 1 minute before creating the numerator for the measure. This will minimize human error from that portion of the process.</p> <p>With the exception of one manual mistake in October 2002, SBC Midwest has ensured that no "zero minute" or negative durations have been reported since August 2002. In addition, SBC Midwest implemented additional controls to minimize manual errors in the reporting of PM MI 11 by mechanizing the process effective as of March 2003. There are no impacts to posted results from November 2002 going forward, –therefore this issue does not adversely affect the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y addressed this issue in Section II, #52³⁸, and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

³⁸ The E&Y reference is from the Ohio E&Y attachment. The same issue is identified in the Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #51.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 624v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3 R)	MI 11	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint reviewed this issue for July, August and September 2002 results. BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 11 ("Average Interface Outage Notification") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules. BearingPoint discovered that multiple notifications may be sent out for a single outage, in order to keep the CLECs up-to-date on the status of the outage, and that these additional notifications are included in the final results for Performance Measurement MI 11. This causes misrepresentations in SBC Midwest's published results.</i></p> <p>As discussed in connection with Exception 183, and E&Y finding I, 51, the basic issue identified by Observation 624 was that in some situations SBC Midwest was reporting multiple notices for the same outage. SBC Midwest changed its processes to capture and count only initial notifications in the results of PM MI 11 effective with the August 2002 results reported in September 2002. SBC Midwest restated the March through July 2002 results on October 7, 2002.</p> <p>SBC Midwest also simplified the reporting process, increased verification, and reduced the possibility of human error in creating the log as described in the updated technical requirements documentation provided to BearingPoint. SBC Midwest delivered updated processing requirements documents (BTRs) to BearingPoint on January 20, 2003 via ER # 1658-0103 for clarification on processing July, August, and September 2002 results. In addition, SBC Midwest updated the PM MI 11 BTR to clarify the processing requirements, including the treatment of re-sent notifications, for January 2003 results going forward via ER#255-0203.</p> <p>SBC Midwest proactively updated its BTR documentation to include specific handling for a unique occurrence of data in January 2003 that was not covered in the existing documentation. Three notifications from the same problem manager were included as initial notifications because the manager included new application downtime occurrences in the update notification for the first application. Each one was the initial notification for a specific application and an update for the prior one(s). The manager should have sent the update and the initial notices separately. Since they were not, SBC Midwest chose to include all of them as initial notifications, created a definition for this scenario, and updated the BTR (ER#255-0203) for handling this type of occurrence in the future. January 2003 data is correctly published according to the business rules. SBC Midwest responded to additional BearingPoint clarification questions on May 13, 2003.</p> <p>In its comments on the June 24, 2003 Observation/Exception Status call, BearingPoint noted that SBC Midwest is not following the Business Rules for their calculation of July and August 2002 results. BearingPoint also stated that SBC Midwest is not planning on restating July and August 2002 data; there is not further work they can perform in July and August. BearingPoint therefore proposed to close this observation report as "Not Satisfied".</p> <p>The implementation of new process controls, simplification of the reporting process, and the updating of documentation all contributed towards ensuring that this issue had no impact on reported results for January 2003 results going forward, including the March – May 2003 results filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
				This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section I, #51 and corrective actions have been verified.
O 628v2 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL</i> <i>IN, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-C)	29	Closed, Satisfied Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint reviewed this issue for July, August and September 2002 results. BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 29 (“Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates”) for July, August and September 2002. SBC Midwest is applying appropriate exclusions to the numerator but not to the denominator.</i></p> <p>The intent of this measure is to measure SBC Midwest caused misses (numerator), as percent of all misses (denominator). BearingPoint’s literal reading of the Business Rule resulted in BearingPoint concluding that CLEC caused missed due dates should be excluded from the denominator. SBC Midwest responded that removing these orders from the denominator would result in an artificial lowering of the SBC Midwest performance, contrary to the intent of the business rule. SBC Midwest believes that the business rule requires that all orders that are delayed, but are not delayed due to SBC Midwest reasons, should be counted in the denominator.</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review to clarify that this exclusion applies only to the numerator. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the “documentation only” interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing.³⁹ SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these “documentation only” clarifications.</p> <p>SBC Midwest is following the intent of PM 29 by including CLEC caused misses in the denominator but not in the numerator (since the misses were not caused by SBC Midwest). The March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC reflects these clarifications in the business rules.</p> <p>Prior to the business rule clarification, E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation of the business rules. See E&Y Attachment B Interpretation #17.</p>

³⁹ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the “documentation only” changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as “Closed, Satisfied” for Illinois and Ohio and “Closed, Not Satisfied” for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 631v2 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-N)	114, 115, MI 3	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") and MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The technical documentation for Performance Measurements 114, 115 and MI 3 indicates that when performing the calculation for coordinated hot cut (CHC) disaggregations, SBC Midwest should be using <u>the time the CLEC calls</u> the Local Operations Center (LOC) as the start time for each of these measures.</i></p> <p><u>PM 114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects</u> BearingPoint states that <i>"A premature disconnect occurs any time Ameritech disconnects the CLEC customer 10 or more minutes prior to the <u>CLEC being online</u>."</i> Since the CLEC call time is used as the start time, there is no way to capture any instances of SBC Midwest causing a premature disconnect. Contrary to BearingPoint's assessment, SBC Midwest <u>does</u> capture premature disconnects. A coordinated hot cut is recorded as <i>premature</i> if the end-user service was disconnected 10 or more minutes prior to the time that the CLEC calls. A premature cut is identified when the CLEC called to notify SBC Midwest that the cut has started early, and this is noted in the "Beginning of Cut" field. However, the technical documents (BTR 114, BTR 115, and BTR MI3) defined the start time (beginning of cut) only as the time the CLEC calls the LOC. Subsequently, SBC Midwest has updated documentation with the issuance of ER 166-0103 dated February 10, 2003 to reflect the actual process. This is a documentation change and does not adversely impact the March – May 2003 data. In addition, SBC Midwest enhanced the operational and performance reporting processes effective with February 2003 data to include a jeopardy code to flag premature disconnects to aid in identifying those premature disconnects where the CLEC did not notify SBC Midwest of an early cut.</p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint about the noted anomaly in the "Ameritech Performance Measurement User Guide, Version 1.8_02_20_02." The "Definition" section of the PM is inconsistent with the "Business Rules" section. The definition states that a premature disconnect occurs 10 minutes or more <u>prior to the scheduled conversion</u>, while the business rules states that a premature disconnect occurs 10 minutes or more <u>prior to the CLEC "being on line."</u> SBC Midwest will propose clarification of wording in the "Definition" to resolve this conflict (to modify "scheduled cut time" to "CLEC call time") and reflect the description of the Performance Measure Business Rule in the next scheduled 6-month review.</p> <p><u>PM 115 - Percentage of Ameritech (SBC Midwest) Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers</u> Bearing Point cites that <i>"A coordinated cutover is delayed if Ameritech is not ready within "x" (30, 60, and 120) minutes after <u>the scheduled cut time</u>."</i> This measure is calculated based on the scheduled start time. Since the CLEC call time is used as the start time, there is no way to track delays introduced by SBC Midwest. From September 2002 through March 2003, SBC Midwest's implementation of PM 115 measured "scheduled time" to begin time, using the CLEC call time as "begin time" for the cut. This interpretation is in compliance with the business rules. However, SBC Midwest believes that utilizing the CLEC call time as the start time to calculate delayed coordinated conversions produces the most meaningful result. The intent of this performance measure is to identify "SBC Midwest Caused Delays." There is no methodology available to measure whether SBC Midwest resources were available at the time the coordinated cutover was "scheduled" and measuring the delay would be meaningless since the cut cannot actually start until the CLEC calls. Therefore effective with April 2003 data, SBC Midwest</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact²⁷</i>	<i>States Test Points²⁸</i>	<i>PMs²⁹</i>	<i>Status³⁰</i>	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹</i>
				<p>measures whether a delay was caused by SBC Midwest once the cutover is initiated by the CLEC. SBC Midwest will propose changes to PM 115 Business Rules at the next scheduled collaborative to clarify the definition and description of the scheduled cut time.</p> <p><u>MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval</u> BearingPoint cites that <i><u>"The start date and time is the date and time the central office/translations work begins."</u></i> <i>SBC Midwest is using the CLEC call time as the start time, which is not the start time stated in the business rules.</i></p> <p>This PM measures whether SBC Midwest has started a Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) within an hour of the "start scheduled time." Currently SBC Midwest measures the interval from the scheduled time to the CLEC call time, which initiates the cut. The definition in MI 3 identifies the intent is to measure whether CHCs <i>started</i> within one hour of the cut scheduled time. The Business Rule further defines the "start" as when the central office work begins. SBC Midwest's process assumes that all work begins when the CLEC calls to initiate the cut. In addition as noted below, data for PM 114.1 demonstrates that SBC Midwest not only starts but finishes coordinated conversions within the agreed upon provisioning intervals.</p> <p>Until May 1, 2003, SBC Midwest measured from the cut schedule time to the CLEC call time. SBC Midwest believed this to be the most accurate way to measure as all cuts are "started" when the CLEC calls as agreed upon in industry collaboratives and the performance measure definition states that the measure is for cutover started within one hour of the scheduled time. The business rules for this measure also state that the "cutover is considered complete when the work is completed by Ameritech." This performance is measured in Performance Measure 114.1 –"CHC/FDT LNP with Loop provisioning Interval." This performance measure requires SBC Midwest to provision 9 lines or less within one hour and 10-24 lines within two hours.</p> <p>In an effort to satisfy BearingPoint, SBC Midwest developed a more stringent method of reporting the performance intended for this particular measure. Effective May 1, 2003, SBC Midwest implemented a process change that will modify the calculation to measure each CHC from the time the CLEC calls to initiate the cut to the time SBC Midwest calls the CLEC back to advise them of the cut completion. By using the CLEC call time as the "start" through the cut "completion" time, SBC Midwest will be applying a far more stringent measurement than what is required in MI 3. The performance measure states that the start time is when the central office work begins and only requires measurement of the "start." SBC Midwest will not only be calculating the additional time between the CLEC call and the CO start time but also including the duration of the cut. These additional time increments will hold SBC Midwest to a higher standard than required for this performance measure.</p> <p>In closing Observation 631, BearingPoint noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For PM 114, SBC Midwest is not calculating consistent with the business rules in place for July-September, 2002 and will implement calculation changes such that future months will be consistent with the business rules. For PM 115 and MI 3, the modifications that SBC Midwest is implementing would also not be in accordance with the existing business rules, but that if approved by the collaborative and implemented consistently with Ameritech's current assertions, these modifications would appear to provide a reasonable basis for measuring the underlying activities associated with coordinated conversions, and produce the necessary data for Ameritech to calculate

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
				<p>Performance Measurements 115 and MI 3 consistently with the published metrics business rules.</p> <p>There are no negative impacts to the March – May data filed with the FCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A business rule clarification is required at the next six-month review to resolve issues related to the anomaly in PM 114. The other issues for PM 114 were resolved with a documentation update and process enhancement from February 2003 forward. • A business rule clarification is required at the next six-month review to resolve the issue documented for PM 115 in order to make the business rule meaningful. Both implementations (before and after May 1, 2003) of PM 115 reasonably address the overall intent of the measure. • SBC Midwest’s interpretation of PM MI 3 is appropriate. Clarification of this performance measure is required at the next six-month review to make this a more meaningful measure. MI 3 is a diagnostic measure with no benchmark.
O 637v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-R)	MI 14	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement MI 14 (“Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within X Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket”). SBC Midwest is excluding CLEC caused missed due dates.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that SBC Midwest should not be excluding the trouble codes “CPE,” “IEC,” and “INF.” SBC Midwest issued ER1259-0902 to fix the Performance Measurement going forward starting with September 2002 data reported on October 20, 2002. In addition, SBC Midwest restated this Performance Measurement via ER1259R-0902, which allowed for June 2002 through August 2002 results to be reposted on October 7, 2002. SBC Midwest has provided the updated BTR reflecting the changes made by ER 1259-0902 to BearingPoint</p> <p>The implemented fix and restatements discussed above ensure that this issue has no impact to posted results from June 2002 going forward, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #40 and corrective actions have been verified</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 642v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-R)	MI 14	Retest ⁴⁰	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 14 ("Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within X Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that, although the business rules do not explicitly allow the exclusion of duplicate notices, counting the initial notice is the appropriate process for this PM. SBC Midwest was counting duplicate notifications for manual UNE-P and Resale levels of disaggregation. SBC Midwest issued ER 1477-1002 via the normal change management process to discontinue this practice. This change is effective with October 2002 data results posted on November 20, 2002 reporting cycle going forward. In conjunction with this change, SBC Midwest updated the corresponding Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation and provided them to BearingPoint.</p> <p>All of the changes were made to the appropriate databases and the October 2002 results reported in November reflect these changes.</p> <p>Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest's guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July, August, and September 2002 data months on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint test requirements.</p> <p>The corrective action described above was implemented effective with October 2002 data and, therefore this issue has no impact to posted results going forward, including the March – May data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers indicate that this issue had no material impact on reported results.</p>

⁴⁰ This Observation was previously statused as "Closed, Not Satisfied." However, due to SBC Midwest's decision to restate results for the months of July-September 2002, SBC Midwest has requested that BearingPoint retest once the restatement is complete to verify the implementation of the associated modifications.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 643v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B, 5-3-I)	11, 11.1, 11.2	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is truncating lower dateparts (seconds) during time interval calculations in all of the Performance Measures that use time durations using MOR/TEL data. As a result, these orders do not reflect actual time intervals.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest believes that the overall practical effect is minimal. Using the calculation methodology identified in Observation 643, the results can at most be underreported by one minute. While there may be a statistical difference as noted by the BearingPoint Additional Information document sent March 20, 2003, the difference of one minute in the overall average does not skew the results enough to cause them to be considered unreliable.</p> <p>Additionally, SBC Midwest transitioned this measure from the MorTel system to the ICS/DSS platform in September 2002. In response to the clarification question asked by BearingPoint, the ICS/DSS calculation methodology does not use the method of truncating lower date parts. Nonetheless, BearingPoint considers this Observation “Closed Not Satisfied” because the fix was not implemented during their evaluation period.</p> <p>In its closure status, BearingPoint narrowed the scope of this observation to apply only to PMs 6, 11, 11.1, 11.2, and 95.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue as noted above with September 2002 results going forward. This issue has no impact to posted results from September 2002 going forward, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<p align="center">O 659v2</p> <p align="center">Interpretation</p> <p align="center">No Impact</p>	<p align="center"><i>IL</i></p> <p align="center"><i>IN, WI</i></p> <p align="center">PMR 5 (5-3-B)</p>	7	<p align="center">Closed Satisfied</p> <p align="center">Closed, Not Satisfied</p>	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 7 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems"), 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day Of Work Completion") and 8 ("Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. According to BearingPoint, the metrics business rules state that the calculation of the Performance Measurements 7 is based on calendar days. However, BearingPoint found that SBC Midwest calculates Performance Measurement 7 based on system hours of operation.</i></p> <p>This is a mechanized process and it is only operational while the system is running. Neither SBC Midwest nor the CLECs expect that SBC Midwest will send transactions during the published (CLEC Online) scheduled system downtime.</p> <p>The implementation of PM 7 follows this same philosophy and is only tracking the hours in which a notification can actually be sent (the scheduled system available hours noticed to CLECs via CLEC Online).</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review to clarify that these performance measures are measured based on system available time. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the "documentation only" interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁴¹. SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these "documentation only" clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these "Closed, Not Satisfied" observations and re-categorize those affected as "Closed-Satisfied" since BearingPoint's interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p> <p>SBC Midwest is appropriately following the intent of PMs 7 according to the interpretations reflected in the version 1.9 business rules. As a business rule clarification, this issue has no impact to posted results, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B Interpretation #4.</p>

⁴¹ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the "documentation only" changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as "Closed, Satisfied" for Illinois and Ohio and "Closed, Not Satisfied" for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 661v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-R)	MI 9, MI 13	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements MI 9 (“Percentage Missing FOCs”) and MI 13 (“Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months. BearingPoint found that SBC Midwest excludes “Project” orders from their calculation. However, metrics business rules for the above Performance Measures do not state to exclude “Project” orders from the calculation.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that ‘projects’ were incorrectly excluded from performance measures MI 9 and MI 13. SBC Midwest followed the change management policy to correct this issue for the identified performance measures. The following summarizes the enhancements made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ER 974-0502 was opened to include Projects in MI 9 and was implemented with the August 2002 results, published in September 2002. Subsequently, ER 974 was opened to restate June and July 2002 results and was worked with ER 1520. The restatement was posted with the December 2002 results, which were published on January 6, 2003. ER # 1410-1002 was opened to include Projects in MI 13 and was implemented with the November 2002 results, published in December 2002. Subsequently, ER 1410R and 1410RA were opened to restate August 2002 through October 2002 and June 2002 through July 2002 MI 13 results respectively. These restatements were posted with December 2002 results, which were published on January 6, 2003. <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue as noted above with June 2002 results going forward. This issue has no impact to posted results from July 2002 going forward, including the February - April data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y addressed this issue in Section II, #30⁴² for MI 13 and in Section II, #26 for MI 9. Corrective actions have been verified.</p>

⁴² The E&Y reference is from the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana, and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section II #29.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 676v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B)	10.4	Retest	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and MI 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date") do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business rules. Each jeopardy should be measured using its transaction timestamp (i.e., ordmsg_sent_dt) with the order due date at the issuance time of the jeopardy (i.e., order_schedule_dt or substitute with revline_original_txt if a revision). However, SBC Midwest updates the "order_schedule_dt" with the latest "revline_original_txt" for orders that have multiple jeopardies. Therefore, if the order had three jeopardies, the first two would not be calculated correctly, only the latest jeopardy will be calculated correctly.</i></p> <p>This issue involves the tracking of multiple jeopardy codes and the associated dates to ensure that the intervals are properly calculated. During the code reviews with BearingPoint, SBC Midwest identified software changes that would provide better tracking of the interim due dates. ER 1089-07 identified the planned enhancements that were subsequently implemented with the August 2002 data reported on September 20 2002. From a high-level perspective, this new computer program code tracks and reports the order due dates for all jeopardizes on each order including the occurrence of multiple due date changes. For instance, if an order receives a Jeopardy and no Revision is received, the code uses the "order_schedule_dt" as the due date on the order. If a revision is received, the Revision data is examined to determine the due date being changed by the jeopardy.</p> <p>ERs# 1089R-1102 and 1089RA-0103 implemented this correction for July results reported on January 6 2003 and June results reported on February 5, 2003 respectively. Updated documentation needed for replication was provided to BearingPoint in association with these changes.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue as noted above with June 2002 results going forward. This issue has no impact to posted results from July 2002 going forward, including the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #12 and corrective actions have been verified</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
O 677v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-N)	115	Retest ⁴³ Closed Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. SBC Midwest is only counting orders delayed between 30 and 60 minutes in the "beyond 30 minutes" benchmark and orders delayed between 60 and 120 minutes in the "beyond 60 minutes" benchmark. As a result, SBC Midwest is only counting delayed orders within one benchmark.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint's finding in Observation 677, and has addressed the issue. Following the documented change management process, SBC Midwest modified the logic used for calculating PM115 (delayed CHC/FDT) results beginning with October 2002 data reported on November 20 2002 via ER 1479-1002. In the past, the logic for calculating PM 115 only allowed an order to miss one disaggregation. For example, if an order was 70 minutes late, it would only have missed the >60 minute disaggregation. Now, with the updated logic, a 70 minute late order will be counted as having missed both the >30 and >60 minute disaggregations. This applies to both CHC and FDT.</p> <p>Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest's guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July, August, and September 2002 data months on June 5, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint test requirements. On May 7, 2003, SBC Midwest requested that BearingPoint re-open this observation and continue its testing activities associated with this observation concurrent with the SBC Midwest restatement.</p> <p><u>On July 16, 2003, SBC Midwest provided updated documentation to support this restatement. SBC Midwest has also updated the calculation logic for this performance measurement. Based on this updated logic and the review of the documentation provided, BearingPoint was able to successfully match SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 115 for July, August and September 2002 data months.</u></p> <p>SBC Midwest implemented corrective actions for October 2002 data going forward. Therefore, this issue does not adversely impact reported data for October 2002 or later, including the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y work papers identified this issue as not material for the March, April, May months that they evaluated for Ohio and Illinois. This was addressed by E&Y in Section III, #9 and corrective actions have been verified for Wisconsin and Indiana.</p>

⁴³ This Observation was previously statused as "Closed, Not Satisfied." However, due to SBC Midwest's decision to restate for the months of July-September 2002, SBC Midwest has requested that BearingPoint retest once the restatement is complete to verify the implementation of the associated modifications.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 687v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B)	10.4	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”). For orders with blank schedule_date or if a date cannot be parsed, SBC Midwest excludes the Jeopardy and Unsolicited FOCs from the numerator of Performance Measurement 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) while including them in the denominator.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed the issue above with a code update, documented in the associated ER# 1089-07. This ER was implemented with August 2002 data, reported on September 20, 2002. In addition, SBC Midwest prepared ER# 1089R-1102 documenting a restatement of July 2002-August 2002 data that occurred on January 6, 2003. SBC Midwest provided updated code and documentation to BearingPoint in order to retest this issue.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed this issue for July 2002 data going forward. It does not impact reported data for July 2002 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>
O 688v2 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B)	9	Closed, Not Satisfied	<p><i>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 9 (“Percentage Rejects”) for July and August 2002. BearingPoint learned that SBC Midwest excludes rejects that were falsely initiated by SBC Midwest from Performance Measurement 9. The performance measure is supposed to track rejected orders which should include both valid rejects (i.e., CLEC-Caused Rejections) and the false rejects (i.e., Ameritech-Caused Rejections). SBC Midwest is excluding the false rejects from this performance measure.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest caused rejects for revisions were not being tracked for revisions received under LSOG Version 4; Revisions received under LSOG Version 5 requests were not affected. SBC Midwest identified a method for tracking these revisions as identified in ER 1703-1202. This corrective action was implemented with January 2003 data reported in February 2003.</p> <p>The associated Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation for PM 9 was updated and sent to BearingPoint on February 7, 2003 (i.e., SBC Midwest SYS REQ_PM 9-LSOG4 (eff SEP02-OCT02)_02_07_03). More specifically, the associated Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation state that when the ORDMSG_RESPONSE_TYPE equals 'REJ', to include the record in the calculation. The category REJ includes both valid and invalid (i.e., false) rejects.</p> <p>BearingPoint considers this Observation “Closed Not Satisfied” since the modifications were not implemented during the period of time being evaluated. Nevertheless, this issue has been resolved since January 2003.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this issue for January 2003 data going forward. Therefore, this issue has no impact to the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers state that this omission would have no material impact on the results for PM 9.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<p align="center">O 689</p> <p>Interpretation</p> <p>Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard⁴⁴</p>	<p align="center"><i>IL, OH, WI</i></p> <p align="center">PMR 5 (5-4-M)</p>	110	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 110 (“Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs”) and 111 (“Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs”) for July, August, and September 2002. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 110 and 111 list weekends and holidays among the exclusions for these performance measurements. Due to the method by which the DA database is updated, SBC Midwest is not applying the holiday exclusion to its electronic results if the holiday falls on a weekday, e.g., Monday. SBC Midwest is therefore incorrectly applying its documented exclusions when calculating the results for these performance measurements</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest issued ER1587-1202 to fix the holiday exclusion issue for PM110 and 111:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> System changes were put in place for ACIS/SOD, ALPSS, BRAVO, and DA so that no Directory cycles would be run on holidays. This change was effective November 27, 2002 with the implementation of ER1587-1202. The list of holidays that SBC Midwest is including for these specific measures do not include Martin Luther King Day and Good Friday, which are optional holidays at SBC Midwest, and can be included in this measure as the processing of these updates by the Directory organization is not impeded by reduced force. This process is different from that described in the SBC Midwest Service Center listing for official holidays, published on the web and holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard than using the standard holidays, as might be inferred from the current business rule. <p>SBC Midwest will propose modifications to this business rule for PM 110 and 111 at the next six month review, to include as exclusions 'Weekends and Holidays, except Martin Luther King Day and Good Friday'.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this issue for November 2002 data going forward. In addition, SBC Midwest will propose clarifications to the business rules at the next 6-month review. This issue has no impact to reported data since November 2002 and does not adversely impact the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers deemed this issue as immaterial.⁴⁵</p>

⁴⁴ The term “Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard” indicates that SBC Midwest’s implementation does not comport to the literal reading of the business rules, but does produce a stricter, narrower standard than would be achieved by following the business rule as written.

⁴⁵ SBC’s March 28, 2003 Ex Parte identified this issue as Attachment B, Interpretations, #32.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<p align="center">O 694v2</p> <p align="center">Interpretation</p> <p align="center">Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard</p>	<p align="center"><i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i></p> <p align="center">PMR 5 (5-4-E)</p>	19	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 19 (“Daily Usage Feed Timeliness”). The published metrics business rules state that weekdays and holidays should be excluded from the calculations of Performance Measurement 19. In its posted July, August, and September 2002 results, SBC Midwest is including weekends and holidays in its calculations for this performance measurement.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that the business rules for Performance Measure 19 state that SBC Midwest should exclude DUF files sent on weekends and holidays. When reporting results, SBC Midwest included Saturday and certain weekday holiday transmissions in reporting data. The present calculation procedure holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard than required by the business rules.</p> <p>SBC Midwest Performance Measure 19 is defined as: Usage information is sent to CLECs on a daily basis. This usage data must be set to the CLEC within 6 workdays in order to be considered timely; exclusions include Weekends and Holidays.</p> <p>As required by contractual agreement, SBC Midwest transmits a Daily Usage File to CLECs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, even if a holiday falls on one of those six “workdays.” SBC Midwest calculates the timeliness of <u>every</u> DUF file sent to every CLEC. In the context of this measurement, SBC Midwest considers these as “workdays.” If SBC Midwest were to begin suppressing transmission metrics calculated on files sent on Saturday and Holidays that fall on a weekday, every CLEC could be denied critical metrics on more than 60 files transmitted to them every year. When SBC Midwest calculates the interval of time that passed between the date on which a call detail record was created and the date on which it was transmitted, SBC Midwest counts calendar days, not workdays. It includes Sundays, even though no file is transmitted on a Sunday.</p> <p>SBC Midwest will continue calculating the time interval in consecutive calendar days, including Sundays, for a variety of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAMPS transmits the vast majority of these call detail records two or three days after they were created, even though DUF files are not transmitted on Sundays; • the current calculation logic creates a scoring advantage for CLECs and effectively holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard of performance than required by the business rules; • the current calculation logic does not prevent SBC Midwest from meeting this measure by a significant margin. SBC Midwest has transmitted millions of call detail records to CLECs and consistently met or exceeded the benchmark. <p>At the next six-month review, SBC Midwest will propose to modify the “Weekends and Holidays” exclusion to clarify the business rules. This will correct the current anomaly in the business rules that hold SBC Midwest to the more appropriate higher performance standard. BearingPoint identifies this Observation as “Closed, Not Satisfied” due to its literal interpretation of the business rules.</p> <p>SBC Midwest believes its is accurately calculating and reporting results in accordance with the intent of the business</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				<p>rules for PM 19 including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. In addition, SBC Midwest will propose clarifications to the business rules at the next 6-month review.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers state that this issue is not material.</p>
<p>O 697</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p><i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i></p> <p>PMR 5 (5-3-A)</p>	1.2	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 1.2 ("Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The calculation method described within the technical documentation¹ for Performance Measurement 1.2 results in some circuits being double counted.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agreed with BearingPoint that the method used to count circuits for the calculation of PM 1.2 results did over count circuits that either had a trouble ticket or that had multiple orders, even though the business rule did not explicitly allow for this. At the time of the Observation, SBC Midwest was over-counting trouble tickets and circuits that had multiple orders. SBC Midwest issued ER 1758-0103 via the normal change management process to stop the over counting of trouble tickets and circuits that had multiple orders. This modification was effective with the January 2003 results posted on February 20, 2003, correcting this situation on a going forward basis. In conjunction with this change, SBC Midwest updated the corresponding Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation, and provided them to BearingPoint. The total impact to July through December 2002 results across 5 states was only 250 WFA records from a denominator that totaled 257,223. In addition, the change did not take SBC Midwest out of parity. Based on this analysis, SBC Midwest determined that the change to reported results is immaterial; therefore no restatement will be made.</p> <p>SBC Midwest and CLECs have agreed that the "Reporting of (the current) PM 1.2 (is to be) Suspended Upon Implementation of PM 1.3." PM 1.2 was modified in the 6-month review collaborative, and this change has been implemented. The new PM 1.3 was implemented for the April 2003 results, posted on May 20, 2003 and at that point, PM 1.2 will no longer be reported.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has fixed this identified issue for January 2003 results going forward. In addition, SBC Midwest has determined that there was no material effect (<0.10%) on posted results, thus no restatements were necessary.</p> <p>This issue has no impact to reported results for January 2003 going forward, including the March - May data filed with the FCC. Finally, this measurement will be suspended with the implementation of PM 1.3.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 710 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-I)	96	Retest ⁴⁶	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 96, (“Percentage of Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders”), 97 (“Percentage of Time Ameritech Applies the 10-Digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date”) and 98 (“Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days of Installation”) for July, August and September 2002. With respect to PM 96 BearingPoint found that SBC Midwest’s technical documentation for PM 96 excluded CLEC caused misses, which is not an allowed exclusion in the published Metrics Business Rules for these measures.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest removed the exclusion of CLEC caused misses from the denominator for PM 96 via enhancement request (ER 1450-1002) beginning with November 2002 results reported on December 20, 2002.</p> <p>SBC Midwest also updated the PM Criteria document for PM 96 and supplied this documentation (PM96_LNP_2001_01b) to BearingPoint on January 15, 2003.</p> <p>Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest’s guidelines, SBC Midwest is restated this measure, for the July, August, and September 2002 data months, on July 7, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint test requirements. On May 8, 2003, SBC Midwest requested that BearingPoint re-open this observation and continue its testing activities associated with this observation concurrent with the SBC Midwest restatement.</p> <p>SBC implemented corrective action to resolve issues identified on this observation effective with November 2002 results. Reported results for subsequent months are not adversely impacted and therefore, this observation does not affect the results for March - May 2003 filed with the FCC.</p>

⁴⁶ This Observation was previously statused as “Closed, Not Satisfied”. However, due to SBC Midwest’s decision to restate for the months of July-September 2002, SBC Midwest has requested that BearingPoint retest once the restatement is complete to verify the implementation of the associated modifications.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 711 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL</i>		Closed Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 45 and 58 (“Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates”) for July, August and September 2002. BearingPoint determined that SBC Midwest is not properly excluding “CLEC caused misses” from the published performance measure results. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 45 and 58, list “CLEC caused misses” as an exclusion. Using SBC Midwest’s technical documentation as a guide, BearingPoint has concluded that SBC Midwest is excluding CLEC caused misses from the calculation of the numerator of performance measures 45 and 58, but is not excluding CLEC caused misses from the calculation of the denominator.</i></p> <p>These PMs measure SBC Midwest’s performance by tracking missed due dates caused by SBC Midwest. Although SBC Midwest agrees that the current business rules do not explicitly state that “CLEC caused misses” should be excluded only from the numerator, excluding these orders from the total order base (denominator) would produce inaccurate results for these PMs by unfairly lowering SBC Midwest’s performance. The intent of this measure is to measure the percent of total orders that are missed because of SBC Midwest caused reasons. Therefore, all orders, including “CLEC caused misses” in any form, should be included in the total orders counted and included in the denominator.</p>
	<i>IN, WI</i>	45, 58	Closed Not Satisfied	<p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review to clarify that this exclusion is to be applied to the numerator only. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the “documentation only” interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁴⁷. SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these “documentation only” clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these “Closed, Not Satisfied” observations and re-categorize those affected as “Closed-Satisfied” since BearingPoint’s interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p>
	PMR 5 (5-4-C, 5-4-Q)			<p>SBC Midwest is appropriately following the intent of PMs 45 and 58. In addition, SBC Midwest believes this will be validated when BearingPoint reevaluates this measure with the updated set of Business Rules agreed to by CLECs and commission staffs. Therefore, SBC Midwest believes it has appropriately calculated posted results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

⁴⁷ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the “documentation only” changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as “Closed, Satisfied” for Illinois and Ohio and “Closed, Not Satisfied” for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B #17.
O 719 Interpretation No Impact	IL IN, WI PMR 5 (5-4-G)	78	Closed Satisfied Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months. Using SBC Midwest’s technical documentation as a guide, BearingPoint has concluded that SBC Midwest is excluding “customer caused misses,” which is not listed as a valid exclusion in the published metrics business rules.</i></p> <p>This PM measures SBC Midwest’s performance by tracking the average interconnection trunk installation interval. SBC Midwest agrees that the version 1.8 business rules do not explicitly state “customer caused misses” should be excluded. However, SBC Midwest believes that it is an obvious conclusion to reach, as including these orders would result in an artificial lowering of the SBC Midwest performance. The intent of this measure is to measure SBC Midwest caused misses, and “customer caused misses” in any form should not lower the SBC Midwest performance result.</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review business rules to clarify that these performance measures are measured based on the exclusion of customer caused misses. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the “documentation only” interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁴⁸. SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these “documentation only” clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these “Closed, Not Satisfied” observations and re-categorize those affected as “Closed-Satisfied” since BearingPoint’s interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p> <p>SBC Midwest is appropriately following the intent of PMs 78. In addition, SBC Midwest believes this will be validated when BearingPoint reevaluates this measure with the updated set of Business Rules agreed to by CLECs and commission staffs. Therefore, SBC Midwest believes it has appropriately calculated posted results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B #26⁴⁹.</p>

⁴⁸ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the “documentation only” changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as “Closed, Satisfied” for Illinois and Ohio and “Closed, Not Satisfied” for Indiana and Wisconsin.

⁴⁹ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #28.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
O 722 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL</i> <i>IN, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-N)	114, 115, 115.1, MI 3	Closed Satisfied Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>The July, August, and September technical documentation provided for measures 114, 115, 115.1, and MI 3 indicates that orders with greater than 24 lines are being excluded from these measures. However, the July, August, and September 2002 published metrics business rules do not include this exclusion.</i></p> <p>While the business rules for these measures do not indicate an explicit exclusion for orders that are greater than 24 lines, the definition of CHC and FDT indicates that a CHC and FDT must consist of 1-24 lines. If an order has more than 24 lines, it is not to be considered a CHC or FDT and therefore should not be included in either the CHC or FDT measures.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has proposed clarifications in the most recent six-month review to modify the business rules for PMs 114, 115, 115.1, and MI3. The clarifications address the 24 line limit for each of these PMs by including the following language:</p> <p align="center">“CHC and FDT orders, by definition, must consist of 1-24 lines, therefore this measure only includes orders with 1-24 lines”</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review to clarify that these performance measures, by product definition, only apply to quantities of 1-24 lines. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the “documentation only” interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁵⁰. SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these “documentation only” clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these “Closed, Not Satisfied” observations and re-categorize those affected as “Closed-Satisfied” since BearingPoint’s interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p> <p>SBC Midwest is appropriately following the intent of PMs 114, 115, 115.1, and MI 3 and believes this will be validated when BearingPoint reevaluates this measure with the updated set of Business Rules agreed to by CLECs and commission staffs. Therefore, SBC Midwest believes it has appropriately calculated posted results, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p>

⁵⁰ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the “documentation only” changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as “Closed, Satisfied” for Illinois and Ohio and “Closed, Not Satisfied” for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B #33 ⁵¹ .
O 725 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B)	10.4	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and MI 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) for July, August and September 2002.</i></p> <p>BearingPoint’s found that exclusions were not properly applied for PM 10.4 and MI 2. A software code migration was tracked through ER 1429-1002 and implemented with November 2002 results, which were published in December 2002. The code migration to the DSS system enabled SBC Midwest to apply the exclusion of CLEC/End User Initiated Jeopardy Codes to the calculation of Performance Measurements 10.4 and MI 2.</p> <p>On January 6, 2003, SBC Midwest restated LSOG 4 and LSOG 5, PM 10.4 and MI 2 results to include the above code migration for June 2002 through October 2002 performance measure results.</p> <p>SBC Midwest implemented corrective action with the November 2002 results. Since these actions have resolve the issues on a prospective basis, SBC Midwest has ensured that this particular issue has no adverse impact to posted results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #13 and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

⁵¹ The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Illinois E&Y Interpretation report as #35. The E&Y reference for the same issue is identified in the Indiana E&Y Interpretation report as #34.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 727 Interpretation No Impact	IL, OH	9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2	Closed, Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The July, August and September 2002 published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, and 95 do not state that system downtime, weekends and holidays should be excluded. However, SBC Midwest's implementation of these measures excludes system downtime, weekends and holidays</i></p> <p>Each of these PMs measure processes that depend on computer systems. Indeed, the measurement of performances that depend on computer systems cannot, by definition, be evaluated when the systems are not operating or when SBC Midwest personnel are not present. The times when systems are not available are published to CLECs via the scheduled system available hours that are provided via CLEC Online. It is not logical, nor would CLECs expect, for SBC Midwest to be responsible for sending transactions to the CLECs when these systems are scheduled for downtime. Downtime hours include Sundays, published holidays, and published scheduled downtimes. The system available hours are based on pre-established schedules available on the internet via CLEC Online.</p>
	IN, WI PMR 5 (5-3-B, 5-3-1)		Closed Not Satisfied	<p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review business rules to clarify that these performance measures are measured based on system available time. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the "documentation only" interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁵². SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these "documentation only" clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these "Closed, Not Satisfied" observations and re-categorize those affected as "Closed-Satisfied" since BearingPoint's interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p> <p>PM 9 measures the percentage of rejects and therefore this observation, which assesses duration, does not apply.</p>

⁵² The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the "documentation only" changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as "Closed, Satisfied" for Illinois and Ohio and "Closed, Not Satisfied" for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
				<p>SBC Midwest is appropriately following the intent of PMs 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, and 11.2 and is appropriately calculating posted results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation (it does not list PM 9). See E&Y Attachment B #4.</p>
O 729 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-C)	56, 56.1	Retest <u>Open</u>	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date") and Performance Measurement 56.1 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. Using SBC Midwest's technical documentation as a guide, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is using an incorrect duration when calculating these performance measures. SBC Midwest uses a duration entitled "MSRD_APPLN_DUE_BEW_DURTN to calculate these performance measures. According to the SBC Midwest SME's, the duration described by the field noted is the duration between the application date and the "company offered due date". The business rules state that the only duration which should be used is the duration between the application date and the "customer requested due date".</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint's assessment that performance measures 56 and 56.1 were calculated using an incorrect time-stamp. Through its documented change management process, SBC Midwest addressed this issue via ER# 1086-0702. SBC Midwest implemented this ER beginning with January 2003 results posted on February 20, 2003. SBC Midwest has not yet completed its work with regard to scheduling of restatements and will notify the CLECs of these restatements via the web site News Page as they are identified.</p> <p>On May 15, 2003, SBC Midwest received additional clarifying questions from BearingPoint. On June 9, 2003, SBC Midwest provided BearingPoint with the names of the data fields that are used to calculate the duration of disaggregation for PM 56 and 56.1, which are applicable only to DSL Line Share and Broadband Line Share. These additional questions did not create new issues.</p> <p><u>BearingPoint requested that SBC Midwest confirm their intention to restate these performance measurements and provide a date for restatements to occur. SBC Midwest is currently in the process of determining whether it will restate for July – September 2002 data for these PMs.</u></p> <p>The issues raised in this observation has no impact to posted results for the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC as corrective actions were implemented in January 2003 going forward.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				The Line Share disaggregation for these measures was addressed by E&Y in Section V, #7 ⁵³ and corrective actions have been verified.
O 731 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-E)	17	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measure 17 ("Billing Completeness") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. If a Service Order (SO) "completes" one day before the end of the bill cycle measurement period and then "posts" one day after this date, it will be included in the performance measure calculations as "late" based on the method SBC Midwest currently uses to calculate this measure. However, by the business rules definition this service order is "on-time" as it completed and posted within the allotted 19 cycles and should be counted as on-time in the following month's performance measures.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest's current implementation reflects an interpretation of PM 17 that an order that does not post prior to the first bill cycle (for the account to which the order applies) has posted "late." This interpretation holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard than the PM may actually require.</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review to clarify that these performance measures. No opposition to these changes was expressed by CLECs during the collaborative, and this change has been implemented.</p> <p>This issue has no impact to posted results. The March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC is not adversely affected by this issue.</p> <p>E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B #11.</p>

⁵³ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois reports. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin reports in Section III #3.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 732 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-I)	91	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 91 ("Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines") do not follow the July and August 2002 published metrics business rules. The July and August 2002 published metrics business rules state that the Performance Measurement 91 should be calculated as the "(# of LNP TNs implemented within Industry guidelines ÷ total LNP TNs) *100". BearingPoint found that SBC Midwest does not use this formula. Instead SBC Midwest calculates this performance measures as the "(# of LNP orders implemented within Industry guidelines ÷ total LNP orders) * 100".</i></p> <p>Effective with November 2002 data reported in December 2002, SBC Midwest implemented new computer program code to report this PM at the telephone number level. June 2002 through October 2002 results were restated in conjunction with other issues on January 6, 2003. The Business and Technical Requirements were also updated and provided to BearingPoint.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed this issue through a fix in November 2002 data and a restatement of June through October 2002 data. This issue does not have an adverse impact to posted results from June 2002 going forward, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section II, #23 and E&Y verified the corrective actions.</p>
O 738 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-N)	115.1	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 115.1 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports") for July, August and September 2002. BearingPoint determined that SBC Midwest is not excluding "Reports for which the trouble is attributable to the Ameritech network (unless Ameritech had knowledge of the trouble prior to the due date)" from the published performance measure results. The published metrics business rules for July, August and September 2002 for Performance Measurement 115.1, list "Reports for which the trouble is attributable to the Ameritech network (unless Ameritech had knowledge of the trouble prior to the due date)" as an exclusion</i></p> <p>The issue in this observation is SBC Midwest not taking exclusion that SBC Midwest is entitled to take, potentially causing SBC Midwest to report lower performance results than what SBC Midwest actually attained. Beginning November 18, 2002 SBC Midwest tracked, but did not code for the exclusion: "Reports for which the trouble is attributable to the Ameritech network (unless Ameritech had knowledge of the trouble prior to the due date)". To address this situation, SBC Midwest applied ER# 185-0103 that implemented the necessary documentation and data processing changes to include these trouble reports as exclusions. Changes associated with ER#185-0103 were effective with the February 2003 data reported March 20, 2003. Since the correction of this issue will only improve SBC Midwest's performance results, SBC Midwest will not be restating.</p> <p>The improvements detailed above would only improve SBC Midwest's results prior to February 2003, so no restatements were made. This issue has no impact to posted results for February 2003 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<p align="center">O 739</p> <p align="center">Interpretation</p> <p align="center">No Impact</p>	<p align="center"><i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i></p> <p align="center">PMR 5 (5-4-C)</p>	28	<p>Retest Closed Satisfied</p>	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 28 (“Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months. BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is not properly excluding “customer requested due dates beyond the offer date” from the published performance measure results. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurement 28 lists the following exclusions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Field Work orders -- excludes customer requested due dates beyond the offer date.</i> <i>• No Field Work orders -- excluded if order applied for before 3:00 p.m.; and the due date requested is not same day; and if order applied for after 3:00 p.m.; and the due date requested is beyond the next business day.</i> <i>• CIA Centrex excluded if customer requested due dates greater than 5 business days.</i> <p><i>Using SBC Midwest ’s technical documentation as a guide, BearingPoint has concluded that SBC Midwest is including orders with customer requested due dates beyond the company offered date in the calculation of Performance Measure 28. Since they are listed as exclusions, "customer requested due dates beyond the offer date" should not be included in this measure</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest disagrees with BearingPoint’s assessment. Performance Measure 28 assesses the Percent of POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed within the Customer Requested Due Date and contains conflicting requirements. The PM definition states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Measure of orders completed within the customer requested due date when that date is later than or equal to the offered due date/interval or, if expedited (accepted or not accepted), the date agreed to by Ameritech.”</i> <p>In the Exclusion section of the business rules PM 28 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• CIA Centrex excluded if customer requested due dates greater than 5 business days.</i> <p>The five-day interval is the standard interval for CIA Centrex No Field Work orders, as indicated in the exclusion and the benchmark. If SBC Midwest were to exclude CIA Centrex orders with customer requested due dates greater than the 5 day standard interval (as the business rule and BearingPoint suggest) and follow the literal reading of the measure which states that it is intended to measure only those orders when the customer requested due date is later than or equal to the offered interval, then SBC Midwest would, by definition, be measuring no orders.</p> <p>In recognition that the CIA Centrex disaggregation contains an anomaly, SBC Midwest has left the prior version of the Business Rules in effect since the Version 1.8 Business Rules were conflicting. SBC Midwest has engaged the CLEC participants in the 6-month review process and the State Commission Staffs to develop modifications to this business rule. A modification to the business rules has been proposed and accepted by CLECs at the recently 6-month review to correct this documentation error and remove the exclusion. In the interim, SBC Midwest has made an appropriate inclusion to meet the intent of the business rule.</p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees that orders are not being properly excluded for ‘customer requested due dates beyond the offered date’. Following its documented change management process, SBC Midwest has opened two ERs to implement the exclusions allowed in the business rules: ER 772 and ER 1437. These ERs address the POTS residence, business, UNE-P residence, and business</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
				<p>disaggregations. These ERs were implemented with January 2003 results on the February report.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed the non-CIA Centrex issues with computer programming changes effective with January 2003 results. Moreover, SBC Midwest believes it is appropriately following the intent of PM 28 with respect to CIA Centrex. Therefore, SBC Midwest believes it has appropriately calculated posted results, for the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>E&Y considered the issue relating to the Business Rule anomaly as a reasonable interpretation as represented in Attachment B #16.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 746 Interpretation No Material Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B)	13	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 13 (“Order Process Percent Flow Through”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months. The published metrics business rules state that an order should be excluded if it is “both electronically generated and rejected if the error is caused by CLEC.” SBC Midwest excludes all electronically generated rejected orders, regardless of who caused the error. According to the published metrics business rules, the only allowable exclusion is for those rejects resulting from errors caused by the CLEC.</i></p> <p>It is appropriate that SBC Midwest excludes all electronically generated rejected orders from Performance Measurement 13 regardless of whether the CLEC or SBC Midwest caused the reject. This PM measures flow through orders. None of the rejects are included in the calculation of PM 13 (flow through) as the order did not flow through and there is no transaction to count; it was not received or processed as it was electronically returned to the CLEC via a reject. Therefore, it is not flow through eligible and cannot be reported under PM 13. Additionally, this situation is already included in another PM. SBC Midwest measures the percentage of SBC Midwest caused rejects in PM 9. This reject percentage ranged between .09% and .49% of all electronically submitted orders between April 2002 and March 2003.</p> <p>The exclusions in the current business rules should be modified to reflect “all rejected orders.” SBC Midwest will propose a clarification in the next 6-month review to modify the exclusions listed in the business rule for PM 13 to address this issue.</p> <p>SBC Midwest believes it is accurately calculating and reporting results in accordance with the intent of the business rules for PM 13 regardless of the fact that it does not meet the literal interpretation of the business rule applied by BearingPoint. SBC Midwest will propose clarifications to the business rules at the next 6-month review.</p> <p>If SBC Midwest’s interpretation is accepted at the six-month review collaborative, this issue has no impact to reported results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. If SBC Midwest’s interpretation is not accepted, the impact to March – May 2003 data is not material based on the analysis of SBC Midwest caused rejects over the last twelve months.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers state that this is not an issue since a reject is not eligible to be counted as flow through.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 755 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B, 5-4-I)	10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2	Retest ⁵⁴	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 (“Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order”), 10.2 (“Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours”), 10.3 (“Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours”), 11.1 (“Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface”), 11.2 (“Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process”) and 95 (“Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes”) for July, August and September 2002. BearingPoint has learned that SBC Midwest excludes false rejects to revisions from the calculation of the performance measurements listed above. These performance measures are intended to track both valid rejects (CLEC caused) and false rejects (SBC Midwest caused) to both original orders and revisions. The business rules do not allow for false rejects to revisions to be excluded.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest has not been tracking SBC Midwest caused rejects for Revisions to PMs 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 95. This is true <u>only</u> for LSOG Version 4 and does not impact LSOG Version 5 requests. SBC Midwest has changed its approach for tracking these rejects and, following the documented change management policy, SBC Midwest corrected this issue for the identified performance measures. ER 1419-1002 was opened to track false rejects for performance measures 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 95 and corrective action was implemented with September 2002 data reported in October 2002</p> <p>The implementation of ER 1419-1002 would result in less than a 5% change in the calculated totals for PMs 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, and 95 for July 2002 and August 2002. This change in results does not meet the established SBC Midwest criteria for a restatement. Although not required to restate based on SBC Midwest’s guidelines, SBC Midwest restated this measure for July and August 2002 data months on June 5, 2003 in order to satisfy BearingPoint test requirements. On May 7, 2003, SBC Midwest requested that BearingPoint re-open this observation and continue its testing activities associated with this observation concurrent with the SBC Midwest restatement.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed the identified issue via ER 1419-1002 for September 2002 data going forward. Results prior to September 2002 were not initially restated, as the impacts of the identified issue did not meet SBC Midwest restatement guidelines. SBC Midwest has since determined that it will restate these measures in order to satisfy the BearingPoint testing requirements. As this issue was addressed in September 2002, these issues have no impact on reported results for September 2002 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers indicate that false rejects represented less than 0.3% of the rejects in any state for posted results as reported in PM 9. As a result, the inclusion of SBC Midwest caused rejects in these other measures prior to the implementation of corrective action in September was not material.</p>

⁵⁴ This Observation was previously statused as “Closed, Not Satisfied.” However, due to SBC Midwest’s decision to restate for the months of July-August 2002, SBC Midwest has requested that BearingPoint retest once the restatement is complete to verify the implementation of the associated modifications.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 756v2 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL, OH</i> <i>IN, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B, 5-3-I)	10, 10.4, 11, 91	Closed, Satisfied Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System"), 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices"), 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects"), and 91 ("Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines" do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The July, August, and September 2002 published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 10, 10.4, 11 and 91 do not state that system downtime, weekends and holidays should be excluded from the calculation of these measures.</i></p> <p>PM 10, 10.4, and 11: This issue deals with whether or not system downtime should be included or excluded, according to the business rules. The Business Rule states, "The start time used is the date and time the reject is available to MOR and the end time is the date and time the reject notice is sent to the CLEC." These PMs measure the system's ability to receive and transmit a reject or jeopardy event back to the CLEC. This is a mechanized process and is only operational while the system is running. Given that these processes are mechanized, the implementation of PMs 10, 10.4, and 11 follow this same philosophy and are only tracking the hours in which a notification can actually be sent (the scheduled system available hours noticed to CLECs via CLEC Online).</p> <p>PM 91: The performance measure is tracking the percentage of LNP Due date interval that meets the industry standard. The Business Rules indicate the industry guideline is established in "business days." SBC Midwest asserts that the implementation of this performance measure is consistent with these Rules. Saturdays, Sundays, and Holidays are not business days and are not included in the time interval for this measure. No special handling is needed for scheduled down time for this measure.</p> <p>SBC Midwest proposed changes in the most recent six-month review business rules to clarify that these performance measures are measured based on system available time. The CLECs did not oppose these changes during the collaborative. These changes have been presented to the state commissions (Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin) as part of a joint motion with an implementation schedule, or they have been filed in the form of a tariff (Illinois) with an implementation schedule. In compliance with the implementation schedule, this change was implemented in all states with the March 2003 results reported in April 2003. The PUCO and ICC staffs have directed BearingPoint to incorporate the "documentation only" interpretations as agreed upon at the collaborative into its testing⁵⁵. SBC Midwest has also requested that the IURC and PSCW staffs direct BearingPoint to also utilize the modified set of business rules that incorporated these "documentation only" clarifications. By using the clarified business rules, BearingPoint will review these "Closed, Not Satisfied" observations and re-categorize those affected as "Closed-Satisfied" since BearingPoint's interpretation of the business rules will now be consistent with that of SBC Midwest. This will allow BearingPoint to continue its testing of the associated test points.</p>

⁵⁵ The PUCO directed BearingPoint to incorporate these modifications on June 5, 2003 with a letter to BearingPoint and Illinois approved a Master Test Plan (MTP) change request on June 30, 2003, instructing BearingPoint to include the "documentation only" changes into their testing and to amend MTP accordingly. As of July 10, 2003 this request is still pending before the PSCW and IURC. Therefore, this finding is identified here as "Closed, Satisfied" for Illinois and Ohio and "Closed, Not Satisfied" for Indiana and Wisconsin.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				<p>No proposal has been made for PM 10.4 in the most recent six-month review. SBC Midwest will address this PM in the next six-month review session.</p> <p>SBC Midwest believes it has appropriately calculated reported results, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC. SBC Midwest's interpretation of the business rules for PMs 10, 11 and 91 was approved in the most recent six-month review, and its similar interpretation of PM 10.4 will be addressed in the next six-month review.</p> <p>E&Y considered this issue as a reasonable interpretation as represented in Attachment B #4, but did not list PM 91.</p>
O 787 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B, 5-4-R)	5, 7, MI 9, MI 13	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August, and September 2002. SBC Midwest is excluding orders with particular order class codes. The order class code is used to identify the type of order to which a product relates.</i></p> <p>Following its documented change management process, SBC Midwest issued ER# 1407-1002 to include orders with the class code of "37" and "65" in the calculation of PMs 5, 7, MI 9, and MI 13 for November 2002 results going forward. Additionally, SBC Midwest issued 1407R-1102 and 1407RA-1102 to restate PMs 5 and 6 for July – October 2002 results on December 5, 2003 and incorporated the modifications identified in 1407-1002 as part of these restatements. SBC Midwest issued ER 1192R-0802 and ER 1164RB-1102 to restate PM 7 on January 6, 2003 for August – October 2002 results and February 5, 2003 for July 2002 results, respectively, and incorporates the modifications identified in 1407-1002 as part of these restatements. SBC Midwest issued ER 1410R-1002 to restate PMs MI 9 and MI 13 on January 6th, 2003 for Jul'02-Oct'02 results and incorporated the modifications identified in 1407-1002 as part of these restatements.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed the issue identified in this observation through ER 1407-1002 for November 2002 data going forward for all PMs mentioned. In addition, SBC Midwest has restated these PMs (5, 7, MI 9, and MI 13) from July through October 2002.</p> <p>There is no adverse impact to reported results from this issue from November 2002 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers deemed this issue as immaterial.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 792 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3)⁵⁶	MI 9	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 9 ("Percentage Missing FOCs") do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business rules.</i></p> <p><i>In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint found that in the case of revision orders SBC Midwest is incorrectly comparing only FOCs (positive acknowledgements) and REJs (rejects) to determine the percent of FOCs missing. The correct comparison to use in making this determination is FOCs or ADVs or REJs.</i></p> <p>When calculating the percentage of FOCs missing for revisions, SBC Midwest implemented ER 975-0502 with August 2002 data to start comparing 'ADV' messages in addition to FOCs and REJs. A restatement for MI 9 was posted on January 6, 2003 under 974R-1002 to restate July 2002 results for MI 9. It also incorporated the changes implemented under ER 975-0502 in the restated July results.</p> <p>There is no impact to reported results from this issue from July 2002 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

⁵⁶ This observation was not included on the April 30, 2003, BearingPoint MI report, although SBC believes it should have been, and therefore does not contain a test point reference.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
O-794 No Impact	WI PMR5 (5-3-C)	12	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 12 ("Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy") do not follow the July and August 2002 published metrics business rules. In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is improperly calculating the CABS disaggregations of Performance Measurement 12 by counting LATA 342 in Wisconsin rather than Michigan.</i></p> <p>BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is improperly calculating the CABS disaggregations of Performance Measurement 12 by counting LATA 342 in Wisconsin rather than Michigan.</p> <p>SBC Midwest implemented ER # 295-0203 to ensure records were counted in LATA 342 for the state of Michigan rather than for the state of Wisconsin. The fix for performance measure 12 was implemented with August 2002 results reported in September 2002. The Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation was updated with the appropriate information in October 2002.</p> <p>On closing this finding, BearingPoint stated that SBC Midwest's February 24, 2003 response indicates that SBC Midwest has corrected the logic to properly count LATA 342 in Michigan via ER# 295-0203 and that this change is effective with the August 2002 results. BearingPoint stated that they are now able to match SBC Midwest's posted August results.</p> <p>This issue does not have an impact to posted results from August 2002 going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers deemed this issue as immaterial.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
O 803 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-B)	10, 11	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10 (“Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System”), and Performance Measurement 11 (“Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects”) for July, August and September 2002. In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is excluding Complex LNP orders with greater than 50 lines from the calculation of these performance measurements. The business rules for these two measures only allow LNP orders to be excluded if there are greater than 100 lines.</i></p> <p>Coincident with the migration to ICS, SBC Midwest corrected reporting logic to exclude LNP orders that are greater than 100 lines. This change was made for September 2002 data reported in October 2002 and is reflected in ER 1136. Based on SBC Midwest restatement guidelines the impact of this change was not material and therefore it will not be restating data for these performance measurements.</p> <p>This issue has no impact to reported results from September 2002 data going forward, including the March - May data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 809 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 4 & PMR 5 (5-3-B)	10, 11	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest appears to be using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurements 10 (“Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR”) and 11 (“Mean Time to Return Rejects”). According to the published business rules for Performance Measurements 10 and 11, “The start time used is the date and time the reject is available to MOR and the end time is the date and time the reject notice is sent to the CLEC.” BearingPoint understands that SBC Midwest uses different mechanisms to assign the “time the reject is available to MOR” and the “time the reject notice is sent to the CLEC.”</i></p> <p><i>Since it is not logically possible for any transaction to be sent before it is available to be sent (and thus have a negative duration), it appears that SBC Midwest does not maintain synchronicity between the two applicable time-stamping mechanisms.</i></p> <p><i>Based on assertions by SBC Midwest and its instructions for calculation, BearingPoint understands that SBC Midwest adjusts transactions with negative durations to have “0” time durations. While this may mitigate some of the effects of these negative durations, it does not yield accurate performance measurement results for Performance Measurements 10 and 11.</i></p> <p>During July 2002, SBC Midwest discovered the existence of negative time intervals for PMs 10 and 11 as a result of server clocks being out of synch with each other. On July 22, 2002, SBC Midwest re-synchronized all server clocks to ensure the accurate capture of start and end times for mechanized rejects.</p> <p>The negative time intervals in PMs 10 and 11 were in the range of -1 to -7 minutes of which 96% were less than -5 minutes. In addition, the average response time reported in August (after the re-sync) for SBC Midwest across all 5 states, 3.72 minutes, was not significantly different from the July average response time of 2.28 minutes. This would indicate that the server timing issue did not play a significant role in the measurement of results.</p> <p>Based on the SBC Midwest restatement guidelines and because the exact difference cannot be calculated, SBC Midwest cannot restate July results.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed the issue identified in this observation through the re-synchronization of the system in July 2002. This issue has no impact to reported results from August 2002 data going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 815 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-N)	114	Closed Satisfied ⁵⁷	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") do not follow the published metrics business rules for July, August and September 2002. BearingPoint observed that SBC Midwest's numerator calculation does not match the published metrics business rules. The business rules indicate that an order should be included in the numerator if SBC Midwest disconnects the customer "10 minutes or more prior to the scheduled conversion time". SBC Midwest's numerator calculation only counts orders that are disconnected 11 minutes or more prior to the scheduled conversion</i></p> <p>ER 512-0303 was issued to change the calculation and Business Technical Requirements documentation to be effective with February 2003 data reported March 20, 2003. SBC Midwest is restating July 2002, through January 2003, coincident with ER 512R-0303, May 5, 2003.</p> <p>BearingPoint reported that based on SBC Midwest's May 5, 2003 restatement and the response and updated documentation provided on June 9, 2003, BearingPoint agrees that the numerator calculation for the FDT disaggregation of Performance Measurement 114 is posted correctly, including orders disconnected 10 or more minutes prior to the scheduled conversion time. BearingPoint closed this Observation Report on July 1, 2003.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this issue effective with February 2003 data going forward and a restatement of July 2002 through January 2003 data. This issue has no impact to reported results for July 2002 data going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

⁵⁷ A status of "Closed Satisfied" describes a situation where SBC Midwest's response to an Observation or Exception successfully resolved any issue that BearingPoint had with respect to the circumstances that generated the finding

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 823 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-B)	10, 11	Retest	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurements 10, ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System") and 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects") do not follow the July or August 2002 published metrics business rules. In the process of conducting the PMR5 test, BearingPoint has found an inconsistency in SBC Midwest's July and August 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 10 and Performance Measurement 11. According to the business rules, these two performance measurements should have the same denominator, "total mechanized rejects." However, the July and August posted results for these two performance measurements report different denominators (volumes).</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest issued ER 1137-0802 to correct the improper exclusion of auto/man (received electronically/handled manually) rejects in PM 10 for LSOG 5 orders for August 02 data reported on September 20, 2002. Additionally, SBC Midwest issued ER 1137R-0802 to restate this measure for April 2002 through Jul 2002 data on September 5, 2003. SBC Midwest did not implement corrective action at that time for Performance Measure 11. As a result, the performance results for Performance Measure 10 include both auto/auto and auto/man rejects whereas PM 11 includes only auto/auto rejects.</p> <p>Coincident to the implementation of the changes agreed to in the six-month review, SBC Midwest has issued ER 346-0203 that will include a modification to include auto/man rejects for Performance Measure 11. These changes, effective with April 2003 data, will bring the denominators for these two performance measures into agreement. No restatements are planned for PM 11 because it is a diagnostic measure with no benchmark. SBC Midwest will implement this modification on a going forward basis.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue for PM 10 for August 2002 data going forward and also restated April 2002 through July 2002 data. This issue has no impact to PM 10 reported results for August 2002 data going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>PM 11 is a diagnostic PM with no benchmark; therefore, SBC Midwest does not plan to restate results for this issue.</p> <p>This issue for PM 10 was addressed by E&Y in Section I #17 and corrective actions have been verified.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 834 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-I)	91	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 91 (“Percent of LNP Only Due Date within Industry Guidelines”) for July, August, and September 2002. In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint determined that SBC Midwest does not exclude “NPAC caused delays” from the published performance metrics results. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurement 91 list “NPAC caused delays” as an exclusion.</i></p> <p>The criteria to exclude “NPAC caused delays” became effective coincident with ER 250-0203 effective with February 2003 results, reported March 20, 2003. As a result, NPAC caused misses are excluded from the measure effective with the February 2003 report month.</p> <p>While it is correct that SBC Midwest did not exclude NPAC caused misses for July, August, and September 2002, it is immaterial to the performance results since SBC Midwest’s failure to exclude NPAC caused delays resulted in this holding SBC Midwest to a higher standard than the performance measure calls for and no restatements are planned.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue with the implementation of ER 250-0203 for February 2003 results going forward. Therefore, this issue has no impact to reported results after February 2003 and did not adversely affect March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>
O 835 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4-I)	91	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 91 (“Percent of LNP Only Due Date within Industry Guidelines”) for July, August, and September 2002. (CLEC caused or requested delays)). In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint determined that SBC Midwest does not exclude “CLEC caused or requested delays,” from the published performance measurement. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurement 91 list “CLEC caused or requested delays” as an exclusion.</i></p> <p>The criteria to exclude “CLEC caused or requested delays” became effective coincident with ER 250-0203 effective with February 2003 results reported on March 20, 2003. As a result, CLEC caused or requested delays are excluded from the measure effective with the February 2003 report month.</p> <p>While it is correct that SBC Midwest did not exclude CLEC caused misses for July, August, and September 2002, it is immaterial to the performance results since SBC Midwest’s failure to exclude “CLEC caused or requested delays” for PM 91 resulted in this holding SBC Midwest to a higher standard than the performance measure calls for; no restatements are planned.</p> <p>SBC Midwest has addressed the identified issue with the implementation of ER 250-0203 for February 2003 results going forward. Therefore, this issue has no impact on reported results after January 2003. The March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC is not affected by this issue.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 845 Interpretation Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-4)	18	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>In the process of conducting the PMR 5 (Metrics Calculation and Reporting) test, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest did not exclude holidays when calculating the number of bills transmitted on time for the AEBS disaggregation. The published business rules for Performance Measurement 18 specify that holidays should be excluded from the timeliness calculation.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that the business rules for Performance Measure 18 state that SBC Midwest should exclude holidays. SBC Midwest's current calculation logic, however, does not easily allow for the removal of these occasional exclusions and SBC Midwest has been willing to accept a higher standard of performance (the inclusion of holidays) than that presently stipulated within the business rules. Since this higher standard impacts the CLECs in a positive way, SBC Midwest does not intend to modify its current calculation methodology. This issue is similar to the issue identified in observation 649v2 with respect to PM 19.</p> <p>SBC Midwest is calculating and reporting results in a manner consistent with the intent of the business rules for PM 18. The reported results for March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC are not adversely affected by this issue. In addition, SBC Midwest will propose clarifications to the business rules at the next 6-month review to bring consistency between the business rule and the current calculation logic SBC Midwest is using.</p>
O 846 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR5 (5-4)	19	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculation and Reporting) test, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Midwest is excluding Category 11 Daily Usage Feed (DUF) records from its calculation of Performance Measurement 19. The published metrics business rules for Performance Measurement 19 do not allow for this exclusion.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest agrees with BearingPoint that the business rules for Performance Measure 19 imply that SBC Midwest should include Category 11 DUF records. BearingPoint is not asserting that SBC Midwest failed to deliver category 11 records rather, that SBC Midwest failed to count category 11 records in calculating PM 19. As explained in its response to Exception 176, SBC Midwest has implemented new program logic to enable SBC Midwest to report Category 11 DUF records in Performance Measure 19. This change was made coincident with ER 1462-1002 for December 2002 results going forward.</p> <p>This change was implemented on a going forward basis and will not be restated for data prior to December 2002.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this issue effective with December 2002 data going forward. Therefore, this issue has no impact to reported results for July 2002 data going forward, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>The E&Y work papers for Exception 176 indicate that E&Y did not consider Category 11 records to be required for inclusion in this PM and therefore it was not an issue.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 847 Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3)	MI 14	Retest Closed, Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 14 ("Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules.</i></p> <p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly calculating Performance Measurement MI 14 for July, August, and September 2002 by using the duration from the "Trouble Clear Time" to the "CLEC Notification Time." The published Metrics business rules indicate that the "trouble ticket Closed Time" – "CLEC Notification Time" interval should be used.</i></p> <p>In reporting trouble clear time to notifications time, SBC Midwest is reporting a longer duration than the business rules calls for, and therefore, holding itself to a higher standard. In order to resolve this observation, SBC Midwest is implementing documentation and calculation changes to report the interval from "the time of the closed of the trouble in WFA or LMOS to the time that the completion status is made available to the CLEC" as stated in the PM MI 14 business rule. Timing of the implementation of these changes is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manually Submitted Resale and Manually submitted UNE-P disaggregations were reported using the "trouble ticket Closed Time" – "CLEC Notification Time" interval coincident with ER 775-0603. This change was effective with the May2003 report month results posted on June 20, 2003. Electronically Submitted Resale and Electronically Submitted UNE-P disaggregations are planned to be reported using the "trouble ticket Closed Time" – "CLEC Notification Time" interval concurrent with ER 804-0603. This change is scheduled to take effect with the July 2003 report month results to be posted August 20, 2003. Manually Submitted UNE Loop disaggregations are planned to be reported using the "trouble ticket Closed Time" – "CLEC Notification Time" interval concurrent with ER 805-0603. This change is scheduled to take effect with July 2003 report month results to be posted August 20, 2003. Electronically Submitted UNE Loop disaggregations are planned to be reported using the "trouble ticket Closed Time" – "CLEC Notification Time" interval concurrent with ER 805A-0603. This change is scheduled for implementation effective with the August 2003 report month results to be posted September 22, 2003. <p>Updated Technical Requirements documentation for the respective disaggregations will be provided to BearingPoint concurrent with dates targeted for implementation of the Enhancement Requests. These changes are being implemented on a going forward basis from the targeted schedule dates. Performance results will not be restated for months prior those targeted for change.</p> <p>The performance results reported for March – May 2003 data include a longer interval than the PM actually calls for and therefore holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard. SBC Midwest results during this time ranged from a low of 86.34% (UNE-P Manual disaggregation in IL) to a high of 100% (UNE-P Electronic disaggregation in IN) during the three month period, with only 18 of the 76 reported disaggregations (across all four states) below the 95% benchmark, providing an accurate indication of the process to notify CLECs of maintenance completions.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				This issue does not materially impact the accuracy or reliability of the data provided to the FCC and holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard.
O 848 No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3)	MI 14	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement MI 14 ("Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules.</i></p> <p><i>SBC Midwest is improperly calculating the Resale Electronic and UNE P Electronic disaggregations by including the UNE P Electronic values in the Resale Electronic results for July, August, and September 2002.</i></p> <p>On June 13, 2003, SBC Midwest responded to BearingPoint.</p> <p>Effective with February 2003 results reported in March 2003, implemented computer program code to identify electronic UNE-P transactions and report them as a UNE-P level of disaggregation for electronically processed completion notifications. This change was successful in properly disaggregating over 96% of the transactions. Although this issue is immaterial, SBC Midwest will continue to review the computer program code for further enhancements to ensure that the transactions are reported in the appropriate disaggregation.</p> <p>SBC Midwest does not consider a restatement necessary since (1) all orders are compared to the same benchmark, (2) the reported results for the resale electronic disaggregation, which includes UNE-P, exceeded the 95% benchmark for each of the last six months before the correction was made, and (3) the reported results for February 2003 and March 2003 using the new logic continues to reflect that SBC Midwest exceeded the 95% benchmark for both Resale and UNE-P disaggregations.</p> <p>SBC Midwest addressed this issue effective with February 2003 data going forward. Therefore, this issue has no adverse impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p> <p>This issue was addressed by E&Y in Section V, #12⁵⁸ and E&Y verified the corrective actions.</p>

⁵⁸ The E&Y reference is from both the Ohio and Illinois E&Y attachments. The same issue is identified in the Indiana and Wisconsin E&Y attachments in Section V #8.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
O 854 No Impact	IL, IN, OH, WI PMR 5 (5-4-B)	7	Retest	<p><i>SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 7 (Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System) performance measures for July, August and September 2002. In the process of conducting the PMR5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting) test, BearingPoint has found that SBC Ameritech is excluding orders with particular order class codes from the calculation of Performance Measurement 7. The order class code is used to identify the type of order to which a product relates. Performance Measurement 7 tracks all mechanized completions returned within one hour of completion, and the business rules do not allow for the exclusion of class codes "89", "90", "92", "93" and "95".</i></p> <p>The SBC Midwest posted results for Performance Measurement 7 include class codes 89," "90," "92," "93," and "95" for July, August, and September 2002. SBC Midwest determined that the technical documentation that BearingPoint relied upon to issue this finding erroneously did not include these class codes as appropriate to include in the performance measurement. SBC Midwest provided BearingPoint with corrected documentation on June 24, 2003.</p> <p>This is a documentation issue and does not represent a data calculation or reporting issue. Therefore, this issue has no adverse impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<u>O 856</u> <u>No Material Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-3-A)</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 1.2 ("Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The technical documentation for Performance Measurement 1.2 includes a technical error that results in improper calculation of the performance measurement. Two of the data sources for this performance measurement are 1) the Facilities Modification (FMOD) database, and 2) WFA reports that include all installation related trouble tickets closed in the reporting month. The current implementation of the performance measurement attempts to count Loop Makeup Information responses provided manually by comparing the FMOD records with the WFA reports. The comparison is made by matching "Report Number" in the WFA reports with the "Order Number" in the FMOD database.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>This comparison is inappropriate given that the WFA "Report Number" is the trouble ticket number generated when the trouble was called in, and the FMOD "Order Number" is the Service Order Number generated when the provisioning order was accepted. These data elements result from different underlying business processes and are listed in different formats; therefore the values of the two for a given order will never be the same. As a result, SBC Midwest is effectively not reporting its performance on Loop Makeup information provided manually, which is one of the specified disaggregations.</i></u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest has updated the technical requirements for PM 1.2 correcting the technical error that excluded Manual Loop Makeup orders in the PM 1.2 performance measurement calculation. After reviewing the data for January, February, and March 2003, SBC Midwest has determined that there was either no change in the results (0 misses and 100% result) or no Manual Loop Makeup orders in any state during these three months. Therefore, the posted results for these months would not be materially affected and there is no need for a restatement.</u></p> <p><u>Additionally SBC Midwest and CLECs have agreed that the "Reporting of (the current) PM 1.2 (is to be) Suspended Upon Implementation of PM 1.3". PM 1.2 was thus modified in the 6-month review collaborative, and this change was approved by the State Commissions. The new PM 1.3 was implemented with April results, posted May 20, 2003 and at that point, PM 1.2 will no longer be reported.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued an additional information request on July 31, 2003, which SBC Midwest responded to on August 11, 2003.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest's materiality review indicated that there is no material change to posted results for the months of January, February, or March for the Manual Loop Make-Up disaggregation. Since this measurement was suspended with the implementation of PM 1.3, beginning with April data reported in May 2003, there is no material impact to the March-May data provided to the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<u>O 864</u> <u>No Material Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-3-E)</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>Closed, Not Satisfied</u>	<p><u><i>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 18 ("Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules. The published business rules for Performance Measurement 18 state that "[t]he transmission date is used to gather data for the reporting period." However, SBC Midwest is using the transmission due date to determine the reporting month for a given transmission in its calculation of the AEBS disaggregation.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>SBC Midwest will implement a process change to gather data for the reporting period using the transmission date for the AEBS disaggregation of Performance Measure 18. This change and associated Business Technical Requirements documentation update will be made through ER 871-0703, currently targeted for December 2003.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Based on a materiality assessment of performance by SBC Midwest, there is no change in SBC Midwest's performance upon implementation of this change. As such, SBC Midwest will not restate the results for July, August, and September 2002 for this performance measure, in accordance with the posted restatement and materiality policy posted on CLEC Online.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>SBC Midwest's analysis established that the finding in O864 does not materially affect reported results and therefore has no impact on the March-May 2003 data provided to the FCC.</i></u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<u>O 866</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN,</u> <u>OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5</u> <u>(5-3-B)</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>Closed, Not</u> <u>Satisfied</u>	<p><u><i>SBC Midwest's calculations of Performance Measurement 13 ("Order Process Percent Flow Through") and Performance Measurement 13.1 ("Total Order Process Percent Flow Through") do not follow the published metrics business rules. According to the published metrics business rules for Performance Measurements 13 and 13.1, revisions to orders should not be excluded from the calculation for the Resale, LNP, and LSNP disaggregations. As a result of attempting to replicate Performance Measurements 13 and 13.1, BearingPoint learned that SBC Midwest does exclude revisions to orders from the calculation of the Resale and LNP disaggregations for July and August 2002 and the LSNP disaggregation for July, August, and September 2002.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>SBC Midwest made computer code modification to its reporting systems to allow the capture of the data needed to report revisions to orders for the Resale and LNP disaggregations for these PMs for September 2002 results. As this modification captures the required data from the point in time that it was implemented going forward, SBC Midwest does not have the opportunity to restate if it were required prior to September 2002.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>LSNP was not operationally designed to flow until November 2002. As such, it is appropriate to not categorize LSNP order revisions as flow through eligible in the July 2002, August 2002, and September 2002 results. SBC Midwest's response to this finding indicated that LSNP was not operationally designed to flow through until November 2002, therefore, it should not be included in the results for PM 13 for July, August and September 2002. As PM 13 only includes "flow-through eligible orders". In it's closing remarks, BearingPoint agreed.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>SBC Midwest addressed the issue relating to PM 13 for LNP effective with September 2002 data going forward. The issue relating to LSNP for PM 13 was not an eligible for flow through until November 2002 and consequently was not an issue, as indicated in BearingPoint's closure report. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</i></u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<u>O 872</u> <u>Interpretation</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-4-N)</u>	<u>115.1</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is excluding circuits associated with early and delayed Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) orders in the count of the total number of circuits converted for the CHC denominator of Performance Measurement 115.1. The exclusion section of the published metrics business rules for this measure does not list this exclusion.</u></p> <p><u>Bearing Point cites that SBC Midwest is excluding circuits with early and delayed Coordinated Hot Cut Orders. Circuits, which are not cut over within the defined guidelines of the Coordinated Hot Cut Process, are no longer considered to be CHC orders e.g. CLEC requested early or CLEC delayed conversion. As such, these types of conversions are not included in the denominator of PM 115.1.</u></p> <p><u>The CLEC Handbook, Forms, and Exhibits, Reuse Loops section notes that scheduled conversions must be called for by the CLEC within 30 minutes following the scheduled time. In addition to the 30-minute window following the scheduled time, SBC Midwest also allows a 10-minute window for the CLEC to call prior to the scheduled time. Only circuits whose orders are called for within this 40-minute time period are defined as circuits converted via the CHC process. Circuits that are subsequently completed with a supplemental order as noted within the CHC process are included in the denominator of PM 115.1.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued an additional information request on July 31, 2003, which SBC Midwest responded to on August 12, 2003.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes that the finding in O872 is due to a misunderstanding of the PM documentation by BearingPoint. As such, this observation has no impact to the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>
<u>O 873</u> <u>Interpretation</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-4-N)</u>	<u>115.1</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR)”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months. SBC Midwest is excluding trouble reports submitted after noon on the next calendar day following conversion. The published metrics business rules indicate that trouble reports submitted after noon on the next business day following conversion should be excluded.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest agrees that it is excluding trouble reports submitted after noon on the next calendar day following a conversion. The maintenance section of the SBC Midwest Local Operations Center (LOC) serves the CLEC community and is open to receive calls and trouble reports 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</u></p> <p><u>The business days referred to in Performance Measure 115.1 reflect repair center business days (days SBC Midwest is able to take repair calls). As this center is open for repair calls seven days a week and performs the same function regardless of the day of the week, the proper definition of business days for this PM includes every day of the week.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes that it is appropriately applying exclusions for PM 115.1. Therefore, O873 has no impact to posted results including the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<u>O 877</u> <u>No Material Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-4-N)</u>	<u>MI3</u>	<u>Closed, Not Satisfied</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months. SBC Midwest is not performing the exclusion “Orders for which the CLEC was not ready after the cutover was started” as specified in the exclusions section the published metrics business rules.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest modified its calculations to exclude “Orders for which the CLEC was not ready after the cutover was started” (ER 624-0403) effective with April 2003 data posted May 20, 2003. The updated Technical Requirements documentation reflecting this change was previously provided to BearingPoint on May 5, 2003.</u></p> <p><u>Based on SBC Midwest’s materiality analysis, although there is a small change to the numerator and denominator, there is no change in the calculated results and therefore no restatement is called for under the SBC Midwest restatement guidelines. SBC Midwest elected not to restate the results for July, August, and September 2002 based on this analysis.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest addressed this issue effective with April 2003 data going forward. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the April - May 2003 data and no material impact on the March 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>
<u>O 878</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-4-N)</u>	<u>MI3</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is improperly calculating Performance Measurement MI 3 by counting the number of orders in the numerator and denominator rather than counting the number of loops per order as is specified in the published metrics business rules. SBC Midwest’s posted results for Performance Measurement MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest modified the MI 3 Technical Requirements documentation and calculation to change from order to item level reporting. This change was made going forward coincident with ER 1478-1002 effective with October 2002 results posted November 20, 2002. The updated Technical Requirements documentation reflecting this change was previously provided to BearingPoint on October 31, 2002.</u></p> <p><u>Based on SBC Midwest’s materiality analysis, the impact on the reported results does not exceed a decrease of more than 0.04%, and the measure is diagnostic; therefore no restatement is called for under the SBC Midwest restatement guidelines. SBC Midwest elected not to restate the results for July, August, and September 2002 based on this analysis.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest corrected the calculation errors identified in Observation 878 effective with October 2002 results posted on November 20, 2002. Therefore, this issue has no impact on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<u>O 879</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN,</u> <u>OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5</u> <u>(5-4-N)</u>	<u>MI3</u>	<u>Closed,</u> <u>Satisfied</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is excluding Frame Due Time (FDT) orders from performance measurement MI 3. The exclusion section of the published metrics business rules for this performance measurement does not list this exclusion.</u></p> <p><u>Bearing Point cites that SBC Midwest is excluding Frame Due Time (FDT) orders from Performance Measurement (“PM”) MI 3. As its title (Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval) indicates, PM MI 3 measures only coordinated conversions. Frame Due Time (FDT) orders are not coordinated conversion orders, and therefore are properly excluded from PM MI 3.</u></p> <p><u>Accessible Letter CLECAM01-155 dated May 22, 2001 announced the option for a CLEC to place orders with a Frame Due Time (FDT). The Accessible Letter defines FDT as the “Non-coordinated cut over of end user service for a confirmed date and time”. Frame Due Time allows for the end user service to be transferred without a call from the CLEC to initiate and coordinate the cut. At the scheduled time, the Central Office will perform work to complete the request without coordination.</u></p> <p><u>Although the “Coordinated Conversions” measures include other performance measures that report FDT performance data, those measures explicitly state a distinct disaggregation for FDT. This measure (MI 3) was developed prior to the availability of FDT-type conversions. At that time only coordinated conversions were available to the CLECs. Upon the development of the FDT process, SBC Midwest and the CLECs identified through collaboration that measures would have FDT disaggregations added. PM MI 3 was not one of those measures.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes that it is appropriately applying exclusions for PM MI3 and that the item noted in O879 is due only to a misunderstanding by BearingPoint. As evidenced by BearingPoint’s determination to close this Observation as Satisfied, this issue has no impact on posted results, including the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
<u>O 880</u> <u>Interpretation</u> <u>No Impact</u>	<u>IL, IN,</u> <u>OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5</u> <u>(5-4-N)</u>	<u>114,</u> <u>115,</u> <u>115.1,</u> <u>MI3</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), Performance Measurement 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”), Performance Measurement 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) and Performance Measurement MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months. SBC Midwest is excluding Coordinated Hot Cut orders from the denominator calculation of Performance Measurements 114, 114.1, 115, and MI 3 that begin 10 minutes before or 30 minutes after the scheduled time. The exclusion section of the published metrics business rules for this measure does not list this exclusion.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint cites that SBC Midwest is excluding from the denominator calculation of Performance Measurements 114 and 115 Coordinated Hot Cut orders that begin 10 minutes before or 30 minutes after the scheduled time. Similarly, BearingPoint also states that SBC Midwest is excluding Coordinated Hot Cut circuits from the denominator calculation of Performance Measurements 114.1 and MI 3 that begin 10 minutes before or 30 minutes after the scheduled time.</u></p> <p><u>The business rules and Business Technical Requirements for these performance measurements only include orders and circuits that fall under the Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) Process.⁵⁹ This process, which is described in the CLEC Handbook, Forms, and Exhibits, Reuse Loops, section ⁶⁰ states that CHC scheduled conversions must be called for by the CLEC within 30 minutes following the scheduled time. In addition to the 30-minute window following the scheduled time, SBC Midwest also allows a 10-minute window for the CLEC to call prior to the scheduled time. Whenever a CHC conversion is not called for within this 40-minute time period, the requested work is either rescheduled via a supplemental order by the CLEC or the order is cancelled. In either case, the original order no longer applies and therefore both the order and the circuits on the order should be excluded from these measures.</u></p> <p><u>BearingPoint issued an additional information request on July 31, 2003, which SBC Midwest responded to on August 12, 2003.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest believes that the finding in O880 is due to a misunderstanding of the PM documentation by BearingPoint. As such, this observation has no impact to the March – May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

⁵⁹ CLEC Handbook, Forms and Exhibits, Reuse Loops section, Coordinated Hot Cut Process,

⁶⁰ CLEC Handbook Forms and Exhibits, Reuse Loops section, Coordinated Hot Cut Process, steps 1.17, 1.18, 1.19.

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

REVISED

<i>OE# Impact</i> ²⁷	<i>States Test Points</i> ²⁸	<i>PMs</i> ²⁹	<i>Status</i> ³⁰	<i>BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments</i> ³¹
<u>O 883</u> <u>Not Material, Holds SBC Midwest to a Higher Standard</u>	<u>IL, IN, OH, WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-3-C)</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest's posted results for Performance Measurement 27 ("Mean Installation Interval") do not follow the July, August, and September 2002 published metrics business rules. The published business rules for Performance Measurement 27 state that, in the case of manually submitted orders, the clock should start at the FOC date/time. However, SBC Midwest uses the date/time the order is received as the start time for manually submitted orders.</u></p> <p><u>The calculation to modify the interval to measure manually submitted orders from the date and time that the order is received (as the start time) to the FOC date and time can only improve SBC Midwest results. Based on SBC Midwest's analysis and the SBC Midwest Performance Measurements Internal Change Management Policy, Procedures & Guidelines, the above noted calculation change is not materially different from the results published. Results for July, August and September 2002 will therefore not be restated. This modification will be implemented on 10/20/03 with ER 932-0803.</u></p> <p><u>Based on SBC Midwest's analysis, this issue does not materially impact the results posted for this measure and holds SBC Midwest to a higher standard than the business rules actually require. As such, it has no material impact on posted results on the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>
<u>O 884</u> <u>No Material Impact</u>	<u>WI</u> <u>PMR 5 (5-4-D)</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>Retest</u>	<p><u>SBC Midwest is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 40 ("Percent Out of Service (OOS)<24 Hours") in the July, August, and September 2002 data months. SBC Midwest is excluding all No Access repair reports from Performance Measurement 40. However, the Wisconsin state specific July, August, and September 2002 published metrics business rules for Performance Measurement 40 include conditions where certain No Access repair reports are to be included in the calculation.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest will implement a process change for the No Access Exclusion of the Wisconsin Performance Measurement 40 to include records that were previously excluded as No Access, but still completed within 24 hours. This change will be implemented on 9/20/03 (ER 934-0803) effective with August 2003 performance results</u></p> <p><u>The above noted process change did not change reported results for July-September 2002 from a make to a miss for any disaggregation and therefore does not meet SBC Midwest's materiality criteria for restatement. As a result, SBC Midwest will not restate the results for July, August, and September 2002 for this performance measure.</u></p> <p><u>SBC Midwest addressed this issue effective with August 2003 data going forward. Based on the materiality analysis conducted, SBC Midwest believes that this issue has no material impact on posted results prior to August 2003, including the March - May 2003 data filed with the FCC.</u></p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
E 111 Interpretation No Impact	<i>IL, IN, OH, WI</i> PMR 5 (5-3-D)	67	Closed Not Satisfied	<p><i>Timeliness measures (PMs 66, 67, and 68) of Unbundled Network Element (UNE) loop repairs, excluding UNE Loop and Port combinations, are compared to retail results using dissimilar data points creating incorrect comparison results relative to the timeliness of services provided.</i></p> <p><i>BearingPoint evaluated the timeliness of maintenance and repair results and found that SBC Midwest calculated wholesale results for both performance measures 67 and 68 by subtracting “no access” and “delayed maintenance” from the total duration (received to cleared times). The business rules for performance measure 68 do not allow for these exclusions. Additionally, BearingPoint found that “no access” or delayed maintenance” was not removed from the retail results.</i></p> <p>SBC Midwest believes it has fully addressed the issues raised in this Exception through a combination of process enhancements and clarifications to the business rules for PMs 66-68. For examples, SBC Midwest implemented modifications to both its operational and performance measurement processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SBC Midwest modified its process for application of No Access Time for the 8db loop measured in WFA/C. No Access Time for customer reasons now includes only those instances when an SBC Midwest technician requires access to the end user premises and is denied access for CLEC or end user customer caused reasons. ▪ SBC Midwest discontinued its process of applying “Delayed Maintenance” time for 8db loops, where the parity comparison does not include a similar process effective in December 2002. Additionally, SBC Midwest modified its calculation process whereby SBC Midwest programmatically (vs. the current manual implementation) removes Delayed Maintenance time, effective with February 2003 data. ▪ SBC Midwest gained agreement of CLECs and Regulators to implement “documentation only” business rule changes in the six-month review session to document the applicability of No-Access and Delayed Maintenance for both wholesale and retail trouble tickets as the performance measure is currently implemented. No opposition to these changes was expressed by CLECs during the collaborative. SBC Midwest has requested that the MPSC staff direct BearingPoint to utilize business rules that incorporate these “documentation only” clarifications. This issue is based on BearingPoint’s literal interpretation of the business rules and becomes moot once BearingPoint utilizes this clarified set of business rules. ▪ SBC Midwest has also enhanced its trouble reporting process as defined in the CLEC Handbook, LOC Maintenance Trouble Reporting Responsibilities, Section 4.1.3 to make clear the responsibility of the CLEC to sectionalize trouble prior to reporting a trouble to the SBC Midwest LOC. This section was updated to include notice that “time taken to test and isolate the trouble will not count against the duration of the ticket, but rather will be statused as No Access Time”. The exclusion of time to sectionalize is consistent with the POTS retail equivalent. ▪ SBC Midwest made changes to its Job Aid JA-000-000-092 and the CLEC Handbook (EB/TA User Guide) further define authorized occurrences when No Access Time may apply. <p>SBC Midwest has implemented changes to the underlying practices, systems, data and/or calculations for Performance Measures 66 – 68. BearingPoint has closed this Exception as “Not Satisfied” as these modifications were made on a going forward basis only and did not occur during its three-month test evaluation period.</p>

PMR5-3 and 5-4 Analysis
From the BearingPoint PMR5 Status Matrix (Attachment Dv2)

OE# Impact²⁷	States Test Points²⁸	PMs²⁹	Status³⁰	BearingPoint Issue Description & SBC Midwest Comments³¹
				<p>All fixes were made on a going forward basis prior to the March – May 2003 data that is filed with the FCC, and therefore, these issues do not adversely affect the data filed.</p> <p>E&Y considered the “no access” issue for PM 68 as a reasonable interpretation. See E&Y Attachment B, Interpretation #23.</p>

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing attachment is true and correct.

Executed on August 19, 2003.



Salvatore T. Fioretti